The role of government funding in social welfare transformation:
Narratives from the front-lines of service provision

By

Christina Louise Reinke

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

In Partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Abstract

Federal, provincial, and municipal governments in Canada are increasingly turning to non-profit agencies to provide social welfare services. While this provides new avenues for service provision, research reveals that non-profit organizations, alternately known as the third sector, are finding it increasingly difficult to meet rising demands for service with decreased government funds. Informed by transformative peacebuilding theory and complexity theory, this research addresses the gap in current peacebuilding literature by examining the socio-economic and political pathways of third sector service agencies within a Western civil society context. Through a narrative inquiry method, eight directors from diverse non-profit social service agencies in a Prairie urban centre share their perspectives and experiences regarding funding dynamics within current government—third sector partnerships. Participant perspectives reveal the various strategies these agencies employ as they navigate social service delivery and seek to cultivate key transformative peacebuilding values within contemporary socio-economic and political frameworks.

.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to the memory of my grandmothers: my paternal grandmother, Dorothy Louise Wilson (née Cromwell)—who encouraged me to write by giving me a journal to write my first 'book'; and my maternal grandmother, Hazel Jane MacDonald (née Barkhouse)—who shared with me her love of reading. My thesis would not have been written without either of their gifts.

Acknowledgements

First, I wish to thank the eight individuals who participated in this study—your individual and collective wisdom on the topic of non-profit funding was informative, and your willingness to share this knowledge was both encouraging and inspiring.

I would also like to acknowledge my thesis advisor, Dr. Maureen Flaherty, whose wisdom, guidance, and encouragement was integral throughout this entire research process. My appreciation extends to my thesis committee members, Dr. Denis Bracken and Dr. Shauna MacKinnon, whose combined expertise on social welfare and community-based service provision contributed valuable insights to this study. Many thanks to the students, faculty, and staff of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice at the University of Manitoba, and Global College at the University of Winnipeg. A special mention goes out to administrator Susan Ducharme for continually working graciously and diligently behind the scenes to assist us students.

To my husband, Rod—I could have had no better partner these past twenty-two years to walk through this journey called life. I look forward to our next adventures together. To Lauren and Julia—you have both grown into young women of strength and character, and I am so proud to call you my daughters. I am also incredibly grateful for the on-going support and encouragement of my parents, Keith and Anita Wilson, and my extended community of family and friends. Although there are too many of you to name personally, I know you will know who you are.

Lastly, I wish to acknowledge that this research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) through the Joseph-Armand Bombardier Graduate Scholarship. I sincerely appreciate that without this federal funding, my research into government funding in the third sector would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In Western democracies, the notion of the welfare state is linked with the notion of who is responsible and accountable for ensuring collective rights and needs within society. In Canada, the social service sector can be thought of as where ‘the rubber hits the road’ as it is the primary social mechanism where we as a society attempt to address social barriers that divide us and strive to create more equitable relationships (Baines, 2010). However, for those who work in the non-profit sector, there are often competing tensions. The desire to empower people and address social injustices may be circumvented by a lack of time, resources, and political and social conviction. Compounding this issue is that federal, provincial, and municipal governments are increasingly turning to non-profit agencies for provision of its social welfare services (Haggar-Guénette et al., 2009; Hall et al., 2005). While this provides new avenues for public service, many non-profits, often identified as third sector agencies, are increasingly finding it difficult to meet rising demands for service with decreased government funds. Through the perspectives and experiences of eight directors of third sector agencies in a Canadian prairie urban centre, this thesis explores how government funding mechanisms impact third sector agencies in fulfilling organizational mandates and the implications for service delivery patterns.

The first chapter describes theoretical basis for this study by briefly exploring five elements of complexity theory that have particular implications for service provision, and how these elements intersect with transformative peacebuilding theory and practice. Chapter 2 explores the historical nexus between Western economic and political thought, and how such perspectives are enacted within contemporary politics, particularly within the Canadian context. The next chapter provides an historical overview of social welfare in Canada and charts the impact of social welfare on the current trajectory of government policies and practices. Chapter 4 reveals how the non-profit sector emerged and is variously defined within democratic contexts, as well as its points of connection with the concept of the ‘third sector’. The dynamics of funding arrangements between the Canadian government and the third sector is also examined.

Chapter 5 then moves to describe the study methodology of narrative inquiry, and how this methodology informed the data collection and analysis of the perspectives of eight directors of third sector social service agencies on challenges and opportunities between current government funding models and resource distribution within their agencies, as well as within the larger non-profit sector in their region. Over the course of eighteen semi-structured one-on-one interviews from April 2016 to June 2016, participants shared their perspectives and experiences, and these narratives were then transcribed, analyzed, and interpreted. The major themes are presented in Chapter 6 and reveal participants’ experiences and perspectives on the structural changes in funding models necessary to cultivate more equitable service provision, as well as the various strategic and creative ways in which these third sector leaders navigate service delivery within current economic, social, and political objectives. Chapter 7 turns to examining how participants identify and describe specific policies and strategies that can better enable sustainable social change, such as nourishing values of relationship, an openness to learning and change, and cultivating awareness of systemic barriers for clients and communities. The concluding chapter, Chapter 8, discusses several limitations of this study, as well as offers some final reflections on participants’ narratives and how these narratives enrich possibilities for civil society peacebuilding.

Purpose Statement: Why I wanted to write this paper

For me, social service provision and peacebuilding have always gone hand-in-hand. During my undergraduate studies in conflict resolution, I volunteered for a local agency that supports women and girls in conflict with the law. My volunteering was a natural extension of my in-class studies and served as a foundation for my conviction that systemic inequalities were a very real and present reality in my community and in my country. Living and working in the Canadian Prairies as a non-Indigenous person, locating these systemic patterns of institutional and cultural racism against Indigenous peoples and visible minority groups have meant that I must continuously recognize the ways my 'whiteness' has privileged me—privilege I may not always successfully recognize. In the years since my undergraduate studies I have continued to work in various non-profit and community initiatives in areas of justice, disability support, mentorship, and violence and abuse prevention—throughout these experiences my conviction has been reinforced.

This conviction existed alongside an equal confidence in the importance of the work and that these community-based organizations were doing. And yet, sustainable sources of funding to accomplish this work were—if not always of immediate concern—a persistent obligation one contemplated. Funding flavoured how much service an agency could provide, as well as the parameters of how and where we, as providers, could conduct that service. It also informed how much I could be paid. While the 'well' of funding always flowed, a steady stream never seemed quite secure; it needed constant attention, monitoring, and replenishing. It was clear to me that the heartbeat of service provision might be non-tangible things, such as human caring and compassion, but the lifeblood was economics. I came to realize that funding matters. So much so that the Canadian Council on Social Development named its report on non-profit and voluntary funding in Canada, simply that—*Funding Matters* (Scott, 2003).

Alongside the 'funding matters' narrative there also seems to be a parallel narrative of 'it is what it is.' Among the front-line social service staff that I worked with, funding challenges were an acknowledged part of the landscape, but generally left to be grappled with by the executive directors and board members. I never fit comfortably within this mold. Over the years, I would continually wrestle with these twin narratives and circle back to ask ‘why’. Why does funding matter? What social and economic conditions give rise to the dynamics of the funding ‘flow’? Why is the current funding paradigm ‘the way that it is’? Do these current funding pathways create possibilities for social change?

These questions have important implications for peace and conflict scholars and practitioners because social service provision is the main mechanism for equitably delivering and (re)distributing resources within Canadian society. In Western democracies, the service delivery systems that ensure citizens have a certain level of equitable access to health, education, and/or other social services to maintain their quality of life is often referred to as “the welfare state” or the “social safety net” (Chappell, 2006, p. 5). This concern with individual and collective well-being aligns with the value orientation of transformative peacebuilding which suggests, “…the quality of our life is dependent on the quality of life of others” (Lederach, 2005, p. 35). Although a fuller discussion of transformative peacebuilding will be presented in Chapter 1, it is important to note that as an emancipatory endeavor, transformative peacebuilding is concerned with examining social inequalities within specific contexts and cultivating peaceful, sustainable options at multiple levels of society (Galtung, 1969; Lederach, 1997). For transformative peacebuilding to be sustainable, it is important to examine the economic spaces in which social injustice is cultivated. This means that differences of opinion on how resources within a society are, and should be, allocated is a substantive issue that requires further exploration. This is particularly true in ‘peaceful’ societies such as Canada where social injustice has often been latent, or masked in systemic ways (Wallace, 2009).

This research is an effort to step into the gaps within the peacebuilding literature in two important ways. First, in transformative peacebuilding literature the role of civil society is often referred to in terms of local-capacity building or community-led initiatives (Flaherty, 2010; Paffenholz, 2010; Verkoren, 2008); however, it is mainly considered with respect to countries experiencing overt, protracted conflict and/or of emerging democracies in the Global South—not of civil society efforts within the more 'peaceable' democracies of the Global North. Although there is an emergence of alternative discourses in peacebuilding literature that focus on cross-cultural peacebuilding efforts in a Western democratic context, and particularly in Canada between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (see Clarke, 2014; Ham, 2014; Wallace, 2009), there is still a scarcity of research on civil society peacebuilding in democratic contexts. Yet, peacebuilding efforts are crucial within democratic contexts as structural inequalities that exist are often masked or not sufficiently identified within academic discourse.

International organizations such as the Institute of Economics and Peace (IEP) rank Canada as the seventh most 'peaceable' country (IEP, 2016). However, Canada as a contemporary nation was formed through European colonization and forced assimilation of the peoples indigenous to this land (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], 2015). Detrimental socio-economic, cultural, political, and ecological impacts are still reverberating throughout the country today (TRC, 2015). Further, the social stratifications based on differences of race, ethnicity, class, gender, ability, and sexual orientation continue to exist within Canada and impact various groups and individuals (Gerlach & Hurlbert, 2011). The primary mechanism for addressing these impacts is the Canadian social welfare system. The Canadian Prairies has a unique and complex history with their Indigenous peoples and newcomers to this land, and this subsequently shapes the nature of civil society both regionally and municipally.

Second, examining the economic relationships between the Canadian government and its citizens is foundational to revealing the equitable, or inequitable, distribution of social services within Canada. In peacebuilding, civil society is often understood as a third set of non-state institutions positioned between the state and its citizens (Anheier & List, 2005; Kjellman & Harpviken, 2010; Paffenholz, 2010). Although civil society peacebuilding literature often recognizes the need for economic resources, a focus on economics generally hinges on the obligations and externalities of outside actors—those external international development agencies that provide economic assistance and aid (Lederach, 2005; Pugh, 2005; Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007). As the gaze of civil society peacebuilding has not often turned to democratic contexts, the internalities of state funding resources to civil society efforts are not adequately examined.

This study is an effort to step into this gap in the peacebuilding literature and to provide an expanded view of civil society peacebuilding by placing it within a Western democratic capitalist context. This study does not provide an exhaustive overview of social welfare economics within Canada. However, through the perspectives of non-profit leaders in eight diverse social service agencies in a specific Canadian prairie city, it does shed light on the economic pathways of non-profit social service provision within a particular context, and how and when this social service provision aligns with peacebuilding interventions/efforts. While I recognize that this is a study situated in one urban centre, it is my hope that the perspectives and experiences of the social service leaders in this centre can contribute to further research into peacebuilding scholarship in broader democratic contexts.

Note on terminology

This research was conducted on the original lands of Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene peoples, and on the homeland of the Métis Nation. In an effort to acknowledge the harms and mistakes of the past, and to respect the Treaties that were made on these territories, I dedicate myself to move forward in partnership with Indigenous communities in a spirit of reconciliation and collaboration (University of Manitoba, 2016).

Meaning is carried and transmitted through language. As such, language is interconnected with race, racial identities, and racial privilege (Bell, Joshi & Zuniga, 2007). In Canada, the English language has historically been privileged and was used as one vehicle of colonization and forced assimilation of the Indigenous peoples of this land. The Canadian government replaced names, terms, and identities that Indigenous peoples had used for centuries and re-inscribed these understandings with language that fit within the colonial project.

The *Canadian Constitution Act* of 1982 recognizes three groups of Aboriginal peoples – Indians, Métis and Inuit. Though characterized under one term, these three groups are separate peoples with unique heritages, languages, cultural practices and spiritual beliefs (INAC, 2002). The term, 'Indian,' or 'native' is now widely held to be offensive, yet is still employed in legal and political documents when referring to federal legislation and policies. 'Aboriginal' or 'First Nation' has been acknowledged by contemporary government documents as more acceptable; however, Patricia Monture-Angus (1995) notes how this term may also be offensive to those who wish not to be equated with a term that connotes federally regulated status.

Indigenous means "native to the land", and the term Indigenous peoples is often used to refer to first peoples within an international context and/or in scholarly literature (INAC, 2002). For the purposes of this paper, I will use the term 'Indigenous peoples' to refer to the original inhabitants of Canada (or the singular version when referring to one individual). When specific tribes or nations are specified in the literature, this particular name will be utilized. Although Indigenous persons may variably choose to self-identify as an 'Indian,' 'native,' 'First Nations,' or 'Aboriginal' person, I will only use this terminology when it is specifically referenced in quotations or in legislation.

The colonial project implicates us all, and as such, pertains to later immigrants to this land who have also encountered racist and derogatory names, portraying their identities in oppressive terms (Thompson, 1991). Even employing the static terms 'white' or 'European' can camouflage the various identities, such as gender, ethnicity, and class—and the interplay of these identities – that continue to inform personal and collective experiences and affiliations (Bell, 2007). Due to the limitations of the English language (and the page limitations of this thesis), I have employed some of these terms. My intention and hope is that I add, not detract, to the conversation.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Basis—Complexity Theory and Transformative Peacebuilding

Introduction

Using a complexity basis for research has several implications. It means that the researcher moves from measuring concrete, knowable 'facts' quantitatively, to qualitatively mapping the subject of study, as well as turn from analyzing static structures to that of processes, and implies a shift from a place of certainty to approximating knowledge (Capra & Luisi, 2014). This section will discuss several implications of complexity theory for social service provision by first providing a general overview of the systems lens undergirding complexity theory. Discussion will then turn to briefly outlining five characteristics of complexity theory that have particular implications for service provision. Next, this chapter highlights how peacebuilding theory intersects with complexity theory. Scholars such as John Paul Lederach (2005) reveal linkages between complexity and peacebuilding when he emphasizes, "Peacebuilding is an enormously complex endeavor in unbelievably complex, dynamic, and more often than not destructive settings of violence" (p. 33). In order to reveal the linkages between complexity and transformative peacebuilding, it is next important to explain the concept of peacebuilding, and the various discourses which inform peacebuilding literature, such as John Burton's human needs theory and Johann Galtung's discussion of structural violence. This chapter then turns to revealing the ways in which both complexity theory and peacebuilding theory are rooted in a concern with non-reductionism, context-sensitivity, and relationships, and signify an interest in how power differentials reveal themselves in social institutions and contribute to change and/or resistance within service provision.

A Systems View

A systems view of the world is concerned with the overall arrangements of living things and how they relate to and impact one another. Early general systems theories were predicated on the belief that social systems were naturally favoured towards equilibrium and stability (Thiétart & Forgues, 1995). In contrast, complexity theory views systems as non-linear, dynamic arrangements that contain both instability and stability, organization and chaos (Thiétart & Forgues, 1995). With complexity theory, rather than viewing social structures as solid, static arrangements, the social world is comprised of an "interconnected web of relations" (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 75). This means that the properties of social structures arise from interaction and relationship, and are not created and maintained in isolation. In other words, social realities are constructed through continuous processes of interaction—they are produced and find meaning through activity (Capra & Luisi, 2014). As Law and Urry (2004) suggest, social structures are "performed into being" (p. 395).

The Importance of Non-Reductionism

First, social structures, such as civil society, the state, and the economy are studied with a non-reductionist lens. Such a lens seeks to move beyond the tendency to condense, to over-simplify, or to over-generalize lived social realities (Haggis, 2009; Walby, 2007). Such a framework allows for a concern with "the local, the concrete, and the particular" while still acknowledging the larger system(s) in which these factors are embedded (Haggis, 2009, p. 5).

The Importance of Context

This means that, second, complexity theory recognizes the importance of context, and that the various elements that make up a social system cannot be simply understood by disconnecting and reducing those elements from their circumstances (Haggis, 2009). This contextual analysis allows that an institution or social system evolves in particular ways through its initial circumstances, and that these conditions give rise to a particular history through time, and that it is connected to, and impacted by, other corresponding social systems (Haggis, 2009).

The Importance of Relationship and Communication

Context intersects with the third element of complexity—that of interaction and relationship. With complexity theory, relationships are characterized by non-linear interactions. Nonlinear interactions are interdependent interactions characterized by unpredictability (Davies, 2004). Such interactions challenge earlier scientific thinking which was predicated on the notion of a mechanistic 'clock-work' world comprised of cause-and-effect relationships. Complexity theory acknowledges that relationships can often occur in unpredictable and disproportionate ways—with small causes sometimes producing large effects and vice versa (Law & Urry, 2004).

Much of this has to do with the fact that relationships are encountered on multiple levels of human experience—micro, mezzo, and macro. At a micro level, individuals interact with and respond to their environments through their personal understanding of the world (Phelps & Hase, 2002). Complexity theory asserts that individuals have agency, or capacity to act independently, and this action is shaped by internal models of consciousness, or schemas (Phelps & Hase, 2002). Schemas are the cognitive "mental maps" that shape and guide and individual's perceptions and memories, and how they respond to her/his world (Harris, 1994, p. 310). Schemas exist cognitively as well as physically. This means that schemas are not just conceptual thoughts guiding meaning and action but are in constant interaction with the physical body—or in other words, schemas are "embodied" (Capra & Luisi, 2014, p. 303). Throughout the act of communicating, or exchanging words and ideas, a person's nervous system is continuously involved—monitoring, responding, and mirroring the ideas and physical gestures of the person they are corresponding with (Stacey & Griffin, 2008; Suchman, 2006). Further, Walby (2009) asserts that the embodiment process expands thinking beyond the social realm from that of an ‘actor’ to that of an “actant” who works with a collection of objects, technologies, and bodies (Walby, 2009, p. 79). Through social communication and physical action these embodied ‘gesture-response’ sequences help create and sustain internal schemas, and guide the formation of personal identities as the individual experiences an “abiding sense of self and of the relationship of the self to the world” (Northrup, 1989, p. 55).

Schemas and personal identities are also connected to collective experience. As individuals find interconnected patterns of meaning and relating with others, they form social networks that evolve over time into shared meanings and contexts (Avruch, 2003; Haggis, 2009; Suchman, 2006). Such networks reflect collective ideas, which are then evidenced by social rules and behavioural norms (Capra & Luisi, 2014). In an interactional way, adherence to these collective rules and norms through group membership also generate and shape personal and collective identities that are communicated, modified, and sustained through social networks (Cook-Huffman, 2011; Haggis, 2009). It is within this this interactive context of meaning-making where the evaluation of social situations is possible, and where collective narratives take shape. These narratives communicate ideas, meaning, values, and rules of behaviour that guide personal and collective beliefs and behaviours (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Senehi, 2011).

The Importance of Power and Institutions

Personal and collective narratives are also ‘embodied’ and reflected in institutional forms (Capra & Luisi, 2014). Although institutions are not viewed as concrete, static entities, they are physical manifestations of underlying social processes (Capra & Luisi, 2014). As physical expressions, socio-economic, cultural and political institutions display similar arrangements and patterns of behaviour (Walby, 2007). Capra and Luisi (2014) assert that these similar patterns are as a result of institutional forms coordinating and consolidating the distribution of power.

With complexity theory, power is not considered a fixed entity but understood to be created through processes of relationship (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Elias, 2008). Walby (2009) discusses how this consolidation of power tends to be reflected in relationships based on particular social categorizations such as race, ethnicity, gender, class, and ability. Congruent with elements of intersectionality theory, both theories understand there to be multiple "sets of social relations in the same institutional domain" (Walby, 2007, p. 455). This means that each macro system of politics, the economy, and/or civil society contain other systems of inequality, such as gender, class, and ethnicity. These systems are intersecting and overlapping, but are not fully explained by each of the other domains—each set of social relations is its own system (Walby, 2007).

The Importance of Emergence—Resistance and Change

Due to relational dynamics, social systems are also continuously re-orienting and re-organizing in response to new information (Davis & Sumara, 2005; Wheatley, 2006). As complexity is distinguished by non-dualistic thinking, this re-orienting response can happen through spontaneous adaptations—resulting in both anticipated and unanticipated variations. This unpredictable, spontaneous appearance of new adaptations is called emergence (Capra & Luisi, 2014). For some people within a system, emergent change is exciting and is perceived as leading to innovation and novelty; however, for others change can be de-stabilizing and difficult. Here, an analysis of power is important when examining possibilities for transformation and change.

Capra and Luisi (2014) explain that in order to enact organizational change there needs to be an openness to be disrupted—a willingness to adjust and change. They also note the importance of having social networks within an organization that support and nurture change. This means that power dynamics play an essential component in how social structures adapt, emerge, and change. For many people, their levels of resistance to change will be influenced by whether the changes are being externally imposed or are emerging out of personal reflective experience (Capra & Luisi, 2014). Within emergent change, resistance, adaptation, and transformation are all present and interacting. For instance, Baines (2011) describes the ways in which some social service workers actively and subversively resist the increased managerialism of the sector in order to preserve the values-centred work of advocacy, outreach, and community mobilization. Other such organizations adapt and develop 'hybrid' structures that are an amalgamation of various ideologies and values from both the private and public sectors. Conversely, Frieze (2010) identifies how change can be nurtured and lead to sustainable transformation when she describes practitioners who pioneer alternatives to ineffective systems by connecting with other colleagues, who together, identify and support necessary changes.

Peacebuilding

Peacebuilding literature frequently acknowledges the nature of complexity. As Leeuwen (2013) explains,

> Complexity means that conflict and peace processes are shaped through interactions of multiple actors that each have a certain degree of information and influence but cannot determine the course of developments as a whole (p. 11).

In order to discuss how peacebuilding intersects with complexity theory, it is first important to provide some background into the value orientation of peace and conflict studies in general.

In peace and conflict studies, social conflict is understood as an inevitable, natural occurring phenomenon of human experience that emerges through interaction and relationship (Lederach, 1995; Wilmot & Hocker, 2007). An early theorist in the peace and conflict field, John Burton (1990), postulated that the conflict environment is cultivated when basic human needs are not met. Rooted in conceptions of needs from sociologists such as Abraham Maslow, Burton understands needs to be universal, and need-based conflicts are "…inherent drives for survival and development, including identity and recognition" (1990, p. 39). In Burton's view, the trajectory of needs-based conflict dynamics (ie. either escalation or de-escalation) is dependent on how resources are distributed and what opportunities are available among human societies. Although there have been substantive debates regarding several aspects of Burton's initial formulations of his theory, (see Rubenstein, 2001), the theory does acknowledge the crucial role of economics in not only addressing conflict, but in building peace.

Peace studies scholar, Johann Galtung (1996), also revealed the importance of addressing human needs through social and community development when he explains,

> Defined narrowly, peace studies has a negative focus: reducing direct violence = reducing the suffering, when basic needs are insulted. Development studies reaches beyond that, not only meeting the needs but developing the needs further. At that point, peace studies enters again, focusing on the reduction of structural and cultural violence (p. 127).

In this way the importance of human needs is intricately related to discussions of conflict, peace, and social development. Galtung (1969), also revealed how human needs, and the satisfiers to those needs, can be expanded to include notions of power and oppression. Galtung (1969) contended that violence is often understood as physical violence—overt personal injury, or intended action(s) by an identifiable actor to a person or person(s), which cause physical harm(s).

In contrast, structural violence is understood as injury that occurs at more indirect, latent level through psychological and cultural processes that obstruct and repress the life chances of particular individuals and groups in societies (Galtung, 1969). Therefore, structural violence is not only a discrete entity to be ‘managed’ or ‘resolved’ within social, cultural, and economic spaces, but is deeply embedded within such spaces. With this view, peace is not simply the absence of violence, but is built through emancipatory efforts seeking to reallocate the unequal distribution of power and resources within society—a “positive peace” (Galtung, 1969, p. 183). The linked processes that build positive peace and alter negative conflict is often referred to as peacebuilding (Lederach, 2005).

Concretely defining peacebuilding poses a challenge. Peacebuilding is underpinned by a value-oriented towards peaceful relationships; however, the path and scope of activities that cultivate peace are subject to one’s interpretation of peace and reflect several schools of thought in peace and conflict studies (Paffenholz, 2010). Two schools of peacebuilding, transformative peacebuilding and alternate discourse peacebuilding, will be employed for the purposes of this research as they are the most congruent with a complexity perspective.

Transformative peacebuilding, first forwarded by John Paul Lederach (1997), asserts that peacebuilding involves change at various levels of consciousness and society. Micro level analysis is concerned with individuals and groups interpret and attach meaning to particular actions and conflict situations (Lederach, 1995). At the macro level, social inequalities in social, cultural, and economic frameworks are examined for how they create and sustain conflict (Botes, 2003; Galtung, 1969). At every level actors are empowered to work within their sphere of influence to build reconciliation and peace processes. Top level diplomats can mediate change at state-level negotiations. Middle level actors, such as middle government manager or institutional leaders, are prominent actors who can effectively engage in resolution-oriented approaches. Grassroots actors, as the largest portion of society, can be involved in a wider array of peacebuilding efforts such as community dialogues, peace commissions, and trauma-healing informed approaches (Lederach, 1997; Paffenholz, 2010).

Alternate discourse peacebuilding builds on discourse analysis and reveals the need for peacebuilding to be an emancipatory effort aimed at voices not heard and taken into account (Paffenholz, 2010). This school of thought posits that the other iterations of peacebuilding have been closely linked with democratic institution- building and economic liberalization and do not adequately challenge differential power relationships and marginalized voices rooted in North-South global realities (Paffenholz, 2015).

Theoretical Integration—Complexity Theory and Transformative Peacebuilding

Elements of complexity theory and transformative peacebuilding theory intersect in critical ways. First, both lenses are non-reductionist. Peacebuilding asserts that conflict presents a tension between contradictions within human interaction (Galtung, 1996; Simmel, 1955). These contradictions are revealed through the formation of personal and social identities that try to create a dichotomy between 'self'/'other' or 'us'/'them' (Cook-Huffman, 2011; Northrup, 1989). Transformative peacebuilding asserts that these binary categories of difference are artificial creations that seek to describe and prescribe social reality in biased and incomplete ways (Lederach, 2005). Echoing elements of deconstruction, first coined by Jacques Derrida in the 1960s, such a view of conflict challenges binary oppositions by investigating commonalities that exist on both sides of the constructed division to uncover the common logic underpinning both (Klages, 2012). This aligns with the complexity approach which challenge reductionist ways of thinking and that confine social experience to either/or categories.

Second, contextualizing information in the form of local and specific knowledge is important in both approaches. Within peacebuilding, an analysis of social situations and explanations for human behaviour involves looking inward, to human motivations, ideology, and schema—and outward to the broader socio-cultural context (Druckman, 2003). Key to peace and conflict analysis is how one defines and values a situation, and then understands how this corresponds with others (Druckman, 2003). As we have seen with the discussion of complexity theory, narratives are important vehicles of communication and assist in constructing and interpreting relationships and action. For peacebuilders, narrative can lead to personal and collective empowerment and mobilization, but may also be used as a vehicle of silencing and oppressing (Senehi, 2011)

With awareness of this dynamic, peacebuilding also stresses the importance of communication and relationship. As Lederach (1998) notes, the social construction of meaning and knowledge acquisition "lies at the heart of how human conflict is created" (p. 8). Furthermore, overcoming oppressive systems and building sustainable systems of peace is intricately linked with communication as personal and cultural ideas, beliefs, values, and perceptions are transmitted from one person to another—as well as one generation to another—through verbal and non-verbal forms of expression (Lederach 1998; 2005).

Thus, the importance of a power analysis and the ways in which power can be used as a mechanism of oppression, is also emphasized in critical forms of transformative peacebuilding. With a complexity lens we have seen how it is possible that multiple kinds of social arrangements create, and are created by, one another while simultaneously being part of a larger system. This focus is echoed in peace and conflict discourse which examines how issues of structural violence, or oppression, become encoded in institutional forms of society (Galtung, 1969). This is crucial when examining the concept of social welfare. As Walby (2009) notes, "the concept of welfare is complicated because it straddles activities carried out in different sites and organized through different social relations" (p. 106).

Lastly, emergence relates to peacebuilding values and community development as transformative peacebuilding is an emancipatory framework that seeks to examine processes of change that occur through resistance, compliance, and/or adaptation (Homan, 2011; Senehi, 2011). As Homan (2011) notes, "To work in human services requires a willingness to take part in changing a condition" (p. 80). Changing social conditions requires new patterns of thinking and relating and an appreciation of the complexity inherent in social systems (Suchman, 2006). Further, both complexity theory and transformative peacebuilding appreciate that altering a system's conditions means not imposing changes from outside the system, but by strategically drawing on existing networks and cultivating new relationships in order to facilitate system transformation (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Lederach, 1997). In this way, the peacebuilding endeavor requires complex thinking as people must engage with one another across multiple sets of relations in society where parties can "envision living in an interdependent and commonly defined future, even though at this point it is not yet possible" (Lederach, 1997, p. 117).

Conclusion

This section explains key elements of complexity theory that focus on the importance of non-reductionism, context, relationship, power, and emergence. The subsequent overview of literature on transformative peacebuilding and alternate discourse peacebuilding highlights how Burton's human needs theory and Galtung's structural violence discourse provide a theoretical framework for transformative peacebuilding to contribute to emancipatory efforts within service provision. Lastly, this section also reveals the congruence of peacebuilding with complexity principles. I argue that this connection is key when examining complex systems such as the social welfare system, as the social welfare system reflects various sets of social relations across multiple levels of society. In order to provide a greater context for these various intersecting social relationships within contemporary social service provision, it is important to look backward in time to how early economic and political philosophies informed the emergence of the contemporary nation-state, and how this contributed to the development of social welfare in Canada. The next chapter outlines how economic and political ideology emerged and evolved within a Western democratic context, and then moves to briefly describe how these ideologies inform the Canadian political context.

Chapter 2: The Politics of Economics

Introduction

Although the economy is often explained today in secular terms and equated with ‘business,’ throughout early history it was considered under the domain of moral philosophy (Ackerman, 1997; Bruyn, 2000). This means that economics has critical implications for service provision as it is fundamentally concerned with how goods and services are allocated and how "…people produce, distribute, and consume goods and create services" (Bruyn, 2000, p. 231). As with economic thinking, political ideologies are also rooted in ideas about the central nature of humanity, and "is essentially about the way people ought to live together" (Goldfinger, 2011, p. 2). In modern democratic societies, this normative vision is actualized through the modern nation-state. As such, this chapter first charts the early origins of the nation-state. Then, concentration shifts to tracing various strands of political thought from classical, Marxist, and neoclassical schools of thought with a specific focus on locating these economic theories within the early liberal, conservative, and Marxist political philosophies. Explanation then turns to considering where and how political and economic views are situated within contemporary political discourse. The chapter ends with a brief overview highlighting this contemporary political discourse within the Canadian state.

The Origins of the Nation-State

Although the existence of the nation-state is frequently taken as ‘a given’ in democratic political discussions, the arrival of the nation-state is relatively recent in the historical record of governance frameworks (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006) Although somewhat contested, concepts of the nation-state—hierarchically ordered political communities with varying degrees of sovereignty and authority granted to its leadership—began to emerge in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Europe (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006). The classical period in ancient Greece saw the rise of city-states—villages which grouped together in collectives to consolidate power and ensure that individuals led a more secure, civilized, and happy life (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006). In this form, the reigning monarch was understood to be a divinely appointed ruler who had supreme authority; however, s/he was to rule judiciously with an eye to maintaining order and citizen's property rights (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006).

With the rise of mass violence in the Medieval period, laws such as the *Magna Carta* were enacted to ensure that the authority of the monarch was tempered with duty and fulfilling the obligations of his citizens. The signing of the *Peace of Westaphalia* in the sixteenth century ensured a consolidation of political and economic leadership throughout Europe, and entrenched the conviction that national sovereignty was necessary in order to ensure citizen's security (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006). In this way, the legitimacy of the state was personified in the ruling monarch and was legitimated by either divine law or contractarian law. Despite the absolute authority of the monarch, certain secular philosophers would argue that limitations should be placed on rulers on the basis of a social contract that existed between the state and certain categories of individuals (Friend, n.d.; MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006).

The historical record highlights how the rights of citizens did not extend to all peoples living within the state borders. For instance, Pateman and Mills (2007) argue that the social contract of which the early philosophers championed created contracts rooted in the belief of the superiority of white males within society; therefore women and slaves were generally not considered citizens and were not extended these same privileges. These views also paved the way for European imperialist expansion and the subsequent exploitation and oppression of Indigenous peoples across the globe (Stavenhagen, 2004).

In Canada, our national identity forwards the notion that Canadians are polite and cooperative citizens who have, through their hardy entrepreneurial spirit, built a nation in an uncivilized and inhospitable climate (Razack, 2004). For many years, this white settler story erased from the historical record the peoples and tribes indigenous to the land. As Indigenous peoples were not considered 'civilized' nor 'persons', they were not afforded the same rights and opportunities as other inhabitants whom were considered worthy of citizenship (Cohen & Pulkingham, 2009; Siltanen, 2002). Further, despite a national narrative of multiculturalism, the historical legacy of minority exclusion in Canada highlights how those who hope to make a home in our country must be willing to acknowledge and adjust to this national narrative (Comeau, 2011).

In this way we can see how the identity of a nation was likened to a certain kind of privileged individual—a European white male. The potentiality of this individual soon came to be equated with a community of like-minded individuals. Individuals who not only share a language, custom, and bloodline, but who also share a common destiny and purpose (MacFarlane & Foong Kong, 2006; Trautsch, 2016). Here, the state became personified—fulfilling the needs of the people within its national boundaries. As MacFarlane and Foong Kong (2006) note, "This conception of community was organic; the nation was a living thing that was embodied with mind, soul, and destiny and was entitled to statehood." Rising legitimacy of the nation-state was assisted by the forces of industrialization, and its consequent effects of mass print media, which were able to promote the advantages of consolidating public support and mobilization through growing public education and literacy (Anderson, 2006). The forces of industrialization also paved the way for new political and economic philosophies to emerge and intersect in important ways.

The Liberal Political Tradition

The tradition of liberal political thought is rooted in philosophies forwarded by such thinkers as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jacques Rousseau. In their view, the role of the state was to respect the values of liberty, equality, and autonomy and allow people the right to exercise their independence (Goldfinger, 2011). Further, decisions impacting collective society should be led by a constitutional state who is committed to enhancing the freedom of individuals within the confines of constitutional validated laws (Jessop, 2002). Liberalism grew out of this ideology and placed primacy on personal liberty and freedom (Goldfinger, 2011). With this view, the role of the state was to respect the values of liberty, equality, and autonomy and allow people the right to exercise their independence (Goldfinger, 2011). Although Thomas Hobbes would be most famously known for insisting that the roots of human motivation was rational self-interest, he would also discuss how this rational self-interest (or the 'State of Nature') may be combated with the mutual agreement to live under an enforcement mechanism—embodied in what he called a social contract (Friend, n.d.). The social contract would mean that decisions impacting collective society would ideally be led by a constitutional state who is committed to enhancing the freedom of individuals within the confines of constitutionally validated laws (Jessop, 2002).

Libertarian thinking branched off from liberalism and was influenced by John Locke's philosophy of negative liberty and the social contract between the state and its peoples (Goldfinger, 2011). In Locke's view, negative liberty should be exercised by the state as a means to protect individuals from the illegitimate use of force in the public domain; however, the private domain of religious activity and morality should have no direct bearing on the well-being of the state and should not be regulated (Goldfinger, 2011). Libertarians proposed that free competitive markets were the most optimum means of maximizing welfare as when rational individuals live under conditions of freedom and liberty, it is presumed that such individuals are capable of making the best choices for themselves (Kim, 2010).

Classical Economics

From its earliest roots, classical economics intersected with the liberal political tradition. Adam Smith, largely regarded as the father of modern economics, opposed the feudal system, or the division of labour and wealth based on inherited privileges, and argued that hat this system led to disproportionate lived realities between the rich and poor in society (Abels, 2009; Ackerman, 1997; Bruyn, 2000). The prevailing economic thought of merchantilism was also of concern to Smith (Sowell, 2014). As national citizenship did not extend to all peoples living within the geographic boundaries of a nation, but was focused on those within the ruling classes, the fortunes of those in power was bolstered through repressing wages, and for some, even slavery (Sowell, 2014). Ultimate concern was for the prosperity of rulers—not for the fair and equal distribution of resources for all within the society (Sowell, 2014).

Smith envisioned a new system of commerce to allow for an autonomous exchange of goods and services free from inherited rule, thereby enabling people to develop their own personal accountability and moral conscience (Bruyn, 2000). Influenced by French economists of that time who discussed ‘laissez-faire’ economics, Smith advocated against government favours to the merchants and manufacturers (Sowell, 2014). His vision was that free markets would operate outside these governmental transactions and purportedly allow for a more fair and just allocation of goods and services within the population—thus elevating the life-chances of all.

Smith's economic philosophies were also influenced by the political philosophies of such thinkers as Thomas Hobbes. In the vein of Hobbes, Smith proposed that humans were governed by passions, or 'moral sentiments' (Kassiola, 1997). Such sentiments were rooted in a desire for the acquisition of a good life; however, these sentiments also extended out from oneself to others in what he referred to as 'mutual sympathy' (Kassiola, 1997). Additionally influenced by Jeremy Bentham's philosophies, Smith subscribed to the belief that humans were competitive beings who were principally motivated to pursue their own happiness, or utility (Ackerman, 1997). However, as social actors, the uncivilized and competitive nature of human passion and self-interest was constrained and governed by concern for the judgements and approval of others (Bruyn, 2000). Such constraints led to a mutual social regulation that was thought to be best arranged and harnessed within a competitive system of free exchange, which would be called capitalism (Lutz & Lux, 1997). In such a free system, Smith proposed that the 'invisible hand' of the competitive marketplace could be a social space that fostered a common identity between individuals (Bruyn, 2000; Lutz & Lux, 1997). This shared identity would mean that nonmaterial desires for well-being and recognition could be pursued and fulfilled through the pursuit of material advantages, and lead to increasing wealth for all individuals within society (Kassiola, 1997; Lutz & Lux, 1997).

Conservatism

Classical conservatism grew in response to the liberalism of the eighteenth century and focused more on preserving social order and the customs and traditions that bind individuals through the social contract (Goldfinger, 2011). With this view, humans were understood as flawed beings and in need of a return to more hierarchical governance systems in order to keep such impulses in check (Goldfinger, 2011). Although philosophers and political economists, such as John Stuart Mill, would caution against the pursuit of individual self-interests that did not benefit the larger community (see Taylor, 2016), the most well-known and outspoken critic of classical economic thought would be Karl Marx.

Marxism

Contrary to the initial promise of prosperity embedded in capitalism, the nineteenth century saw a rise in wage labour, unemployment, as well as unsafe and harsh working conditions (Helm, 2011). As with Adam Smith, Marx was ultimately concerned with the productive processes by which humans could feasibly achieve ultimate fulfillment and satisfaction; however, for Marx, this fulfillment was not to be found in the free enterprise capitalist system. The work that individuals do in a capitalist system—producing objects over which they have no ownership or control—forces them to become increasingly divorced from their true, authentic self (Singer, 2000). Marx's understanding is based on the belief that labour is an intrinsic form of human expression. "People express and realize themselves through production, both through what they produce and how they produce it" (Lee, 1997, p. 166).

In pre-capitalist societies, labours were producers who had a close relationship to the items they produced, and subsequently consumed. In *Capital*, Marx argues that under a capitalist framework of markets and private property, labourers are increasingly divorced from the products they engineer as they must now 'sell' their labour in order to survive (Lee, 1997). In this way, labour no longer fosters human expression and self-realization, but itself becomes an item that individuals must sell in order to survive. Thus, individuals are tasked with producing materials no longer of direct use to them—materials which become subject to the principles of supply and demand (Lee, 1997). For Marx, the classical economic principles of supply and demand ascribe a certain value, an 'exchange value,' that is divorced from the human usefulness of the item produced (Lee, 1997). He believed the exchange value of a product was socially determined based on the amount of labour it took to produce (Lee, 1997).

Therefore, those who employ the workers, the capitalists, build up their wealth and power by retaining “a certain amount of the value their worker’s produce” through controlling the conditions of production and employment (Lee, 1997; Singer, 2000, p. 33). This then leads to surpluses—this ‘value added’ is referred to as capital (Lee, 1997; Singer, 2000). Capital is then used by the employer to increase production, which then increases the division of labour, and then escalates the level of competition in among individuals vying for work (Singer, 2000). Instead of fostering cooperation, ‘free’ competition between individuals engenders hostility and conflict. Further, Marx maintained that capitalism was the primary means of human alienation, and that the liberation from this state is only to be found through the revolt of the working class (Singer, 2000). In Marx’s view, freedom from such alienation is realized through the eradication of wages, disaffecting work, and private ownership, most effectively encapsulated in communism (Singer, 2000). Socialism was understood as the intermediate political system between capitalism and the ultimate goal of communism (Scruton, 2007).

The Neoclassical School

Early economic frameworks correlated the value of a product to the costs associated with production; however a shift in thinking began to recognize how produced items could have a *relative* value (Sowell, 2014). Adam Smith illustrated the relative value of resources by highlighting how water is of greatest use for human survival but as a material to be sold, but has limited purchasing power. In contrast, diamonds are of little usefulness for overall survival, but have considerable value when exchanged with other goods and services (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007). This line of thinking led to theories of marginal utility, the roots of what is now called neoclassical economics (Hamilton, 1997; Sowell, 2014).

As with classical economics, neoclassical economics is grounded in the belief that humans ultimately desired to maximize their happiness and well-being through conscious, rational action (Hamilton, 1997). Therefore, the acknowledgment that humans have *needs* for produced items transitioned to a recognition that humans also have *wants* for items in rational, calculating ways (Lutz & Lux, 1997). Economist Alfred Marshall argued that this reality has implications for distinguishing between the comparative advantages and usefulness of certain goods and services, or their marginal utility, and can be calculated based on mathematical principles and equations (Sowell, 2014). Neoclassical thinking also embraced the notion that the optimal state of competitive markets was equilibrium, or stability (Steinberg, 2006). This means that the amount of items consumers are willing to buy aligns with the amount of items that are available, leading to balance and stability economically and socially (Steinberg, 2006). However, economists such as Leon Walrus argued that while individuals seek to maximize their own welfare, they do so under certain distributional restrictions, such as the price and availability of goods and resources (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007; Coto-Millan, 2002).

This led to an appreciation within the neoclassical school of thought that ensuring the economic welfare of citizens needs to consider a few key principles, or theorems. The first theorem of welfare economics implies that markets can operate most efficiently and effectively when consumers consider first and foremost the price of a good or service. Optimally, such pricing would be free from government interference (Blaug, 2007). However, this neoclassical conviction recognizes that free markets are subject to differences among individual consumers and have to operate in real-world conditions where distributional issues can come into play (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007; Blaug, 2007).

Economists, such as Vilfredo Pareto, then argued that maximizing an individual's own welfare did not always have to be of the greatest importance, and categorized criteria under which resources would be efficiently allocated in society—what is referred to as the 'Pareto optimal' (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007). Arthur Pigou built on Pareto's theories and further explained how governments might cautiously influence more equitable re-distribution policies (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007). Thus, the second principle of welfare economics, or the second theorem, addresses such distributional issues by suggesting that wealth re-distribution practices, such as taxation, may be a necessary part of an efficient and stable financial system.

Catastrophic events in the early twentieth century, such as the Great Depression and two World Wars, led to increasing concerns as to how such events contributed to the de-stabilization of national economies. Prior to such events, economists presumed a predictable relationship between money supply and the productivity of the national economy (Herskowitz, 1970). For example, if the quantity of money doubled, then interest rates would fall. Low interest rates would then stimulate consumer spending and borrowing, thus renewing the demand for goods and services, eventually restoring equilibrium in the market (Herskowitz, 1970). Such events such as the Great Depression highlighted that the relationship between money supply, pricing, and the performance of the national economy was not as predictable as had initially presumed, leading the way for what is called Keynesian economics (Herskowitz, 1970).

Keynesian Economics

In the 1940s John Maynard Keynes proposed an explanation for fluctuations in national economies due to these shocks, and advised a way forward (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007; Sowell, 2014). In what would be the emergence of a new field of economics, macroeconomics, Keynes countered that contrary to neoclassical assumptions, reducing production costs through a reduction in worker's wages were not sufficient interventions to establish equilibrium in the market system (Shaw, 2002). He argued that the market was primarily determined by demand, not money supply, and it was the deficiency in the total consumer demand for goods and services that led to fluctuations in the economy (Shaw, 2002). Keynes recommended that intervention in the form of timely government spending and business investment could reduce the negative impacts of market fluctuations by increasing aggregate demand and contributing to the growth of national economies through employment (Aronsson & Löfgren, 2007; Herskowitz, 1970; Sowell, 2014). Sowell (2014) notes that Keynes argued, "Rather than wait for the market to adjust and restore full employment on its own…government spending could produce the same result faster and with fewer painful side effects" (p. 10).

Although macroeconomic theories would later evolve, early Keynesian economics gained wide acceptance among mainstream economists during the post-war period (Shaw, 2002). Importantly, Keynesian economics was foundational for the development of social welfare policies in Western democracies after the Great Depression (Hick, 2004). Furthermore, Keynesian theories influenced the world of neoclassical microeconomics and supported acceptance of government intervention in the functioning of national economies (Mayer, 2002; Shaw, 2002).

By tracing the early origins of economic and political thought, this section has shown the intersection between early economic and political philosophies, and how such views have informed how Western society views the human condition, as well as how it seeks to address concerns of resource distribution and societal well-being. This next section will first focus on how these historical attitudes and actions have influenced current economic and political policies and practices. Discussion will then move to briefly outlining the evolution of the non-profit sector in general before turning to how economic and political discourse has impacted the role and functioning of non-profit organizations within contemporary Canada.

Contemporary Economic and Political Thought

Although political views are based on a common identity, it is important to note that these are not fixed, ‘ideal’ types, but are broad categories which reflect similar values regarding the role of the individual and his/her relationship to the state, and such views are often situated on a spectrum ranging from ‘right’ to ‘left.’ Despite this, hybridized’ forms of political and economic amalgamations, such as neoliberalism and neoconservatism, have challenged traditional categories identified as ‘left’ or the ‘right’ of the spectrum as such political ideologies have adopted various economic perspectives from classical, neoclassical, and socialist philosophies. This section outlines several of these contemporary amalgamations.

(Neo) Conservatism and (Neo) Liberalism

Contemporary conservatism, associated with the right of the political spectrum, are generally concerned with supporting ‘good’ institutions based on certain normative social values (Narveson, 2000). As such, modern conservatism has distinctive attitudes about society and government informed by a scepticism of contemporary developments and radical change (Scruton, 2007). The political left of liberalism is associated with prioritizing the needs of the individual, and balancing these needs with providing for the collective and advancing positive outcomes for the whole of society within a capitalist framework (Janoff-Bulman, 2009; Narveson, 2000). For instance, liberal thought characterized by egalitarianism generally espouses a greater role for the state in cultivating the conditions for individuals to exercise their freedoms and interests. With this school of thought, the state may have to curtail certain freedoms in order to bring about greater equity among citizens (Narveson, 2000).

Although both conservatism and liberalism embody several distinct political ideologies, there are common economic attitudes and views that can be identified throughout neo-conservative and neo-liberal thought. Although neoconservatives are noted as distinctive in select views, such as supporting strong state authority, and rejecting the decadence of popular culture, both are said to embrace individual economic prosperity over community economic prosperity (Brown, 2006). Neoliberalism continues the liberal focus on the individual as a self-determining actor; however, the neoliberal rationale assumes that individuals are constantly measured by his/her ability to conduct adequate “self-care”—and meet their own needs and ambitions (Brown, 2006, p. 694). Measured with this rubric, neoliberalism seeks to responsibilize individuals and limit state intervention in welfare provision (Jessop, 2002). Interestingly, neoliberalism simultaneously pursues the *expansion* of state involvement in market-based activities in national and global economies (Jessop, 2002). Undergirding this paradoxical approach is the conviction of the probability of state failure and the need to involve monetarist, supply side economics in national policies and programs (Jessop, 2002).

In mainstream economics, monetarism is concerned with the value of money in a given national economy and suggests that supply and demand within the marketplace should orient economic policy rather than an undue emphasis on interest rates (Herskowitz, 1970; Mayer, 2002). However, monetary policies do subscribe to using a centralized banking system to either reduce or inflate interest rates on a discretionary basis in order to bolster the confidence in the value of money within an economy (Bank of Canada, 2012; Herskowitz, 1970). In Canada, monetary policies are regulated by the federal Bank of Canada.

Brown (2006) suggests that under the neoliberal paradigm, the market is understood as "achieved and normative"—meaning the market is assumed to be not only the natural order of economics, but as the way economics should be and continue to be reinforced and upheld (p. 694). Here, capitalist market principles of productivity and profitability, characterized by monetary policies, become encoded into discussions of governance—and these market principles become the new norms in which governments are measured (Brown, 2006).

In terms of social welfare, both neoconservatives and neoliberals see government welfare programs as an altruistic means and method to re-distribute resources and opportunities when the free market economy is not in an optimum state of 'perfect' competition (Blaug, 2007). For this reason, both political ideologies are identified with what is referred to as a residual approach to social welfare (Delaney, 2006). Further, both ideologies stress the importance of such individuals being able to mold social welfare programs around their personal preferences and individual traits, thus requiring a minimum of government investment in social welfare (Kim, 2010).

Populism

The rise of populism is also a newer amalgamation of liberal and conservative ideology. As Oliver and Rahn (2016) explain, the term populism can be applied to both right-wing political parties in Europe, as well as leftist movements in South America. Populist ideology has been most recently identified with the politics which led to Britain exiting from the European Union (Brexit), and the 2017 election of American president Donald Trump. The distinguishing feature of populist rhetoric is that it vilifies the 'elites' of society and pits them against the purported solidarity of 'common working folk' (Oliver & Rahn, 2016, p. 190). Despite labour issues historically being identified with left leaning politics, Oliver and Rahn (2016) suggest there is a "conservative tinge" to the surge of populism in America with its commitment to a strong nationalist and ethnocentric identity (p. 202). Thomas and Tufts (2015) suggest that the rise of populist rhetoric is connected neoliberal efforts to restructure work and labour relations that have resulted in the austerity measures of the recent decades and the recent 2008 global economic crisis.

Socialism and Communism

Although there are two broad categories under socialism—socialism and communism—socialist perspectives generally argue that the structure of capitalist, competitive markets are not free or benign as such structures create disparities in resource distribution (Kim, 2010; Scruton, 2007). Socialists believe that humans are all equally entitled to resources, and the onus is on the state to be the administrator (but not moral adjudicator) of such entitlements (Scruton, 2007). All forms of socialist thought also have an emphasis on analyzing and overcoming inequitable power relations in society (Scruton, 2007). Narveson (2000) proposes that variants of modern liberalism, such as welfare liberalism, can also be more correctly placed under the political ideology of socialism. Welfare liberalism focuses on the minimum standard of living that all people must have to live the 'good' life as they see fit, and argue that state and public institutions should be advancing the social resources necessary to meet such needs (Narveson, 2000).

Communism holds that public ownership and management of property, and eventual state abolishment, is necessary in order to advance social and economic equality (Scruton, 2011; Helm 2011). Communist thought is concerned with class mobilization and revolution. As such, many communists argue that state welfare programs and policies can have the unintended effect of diverting discontent with social inequalities by legitimizing and reinforcing the very system it contests (Ferguson, Mooney & Lavalette, 2002)

Socialism diverges with communist thought in that most socialists deny that the eradication of *all* private ownership of the means of production is necessary (Scruton, 2007). In terms of social welfare, contemporary socialist policies, such as social democracy, promote the view that national governments are required to enact social welfare policies and programs that cushion the fallout of capitalist economies and ensure the equal distribution of goods and services (Helm, 2011; Kim, 2010). Further, national governments are encouraged to nationalize assets and curtail massive amounts of private accumulation through regulatory policies (Scruton, 2007). The socialist ideology falls under an institutional approach to social welfare, which sees social welfare as a necessary mechanism to adequately meet the needs of people within industrial societies (Delaney, 2006).

Heterodox Economics

Alternative economic theories located on the left of the political spectrum also challenge neoliberal and neoconservative perspectives (Lavoie, 2013; Lee, 2009). Heterodox economics comprise a loose set of economic schools of thought from various political and philosophical perspectives such as Marxism, socialism, Sraffin (neo-Ricardian), feminism, Institutionalist and New Institutionalist Economics (NIE), social economics, Post-Keynesian economics, and ecological perspectives (Lee, 2009).

Heterodox economics is first premised on the assumption of realism—that economics must focus on real-life conditions as they are, not an ‘ideal world’ as mainstream economics would suppose (Lavoie, 2013). Post-Keynesians argue that due to the continuous ups and downs of economic cycles, uncertainty is a feature of economic systems (Pressman & Holt, 2001; Snowdon & Vane, 2002). This means that reliably predicting future behaviour from information about past behaviour is not always possible or likely. In such a relatively uncertain world, heterodox economists also posit that humans and do not always behave as rational 'optimizers'. In this way, humans revise and adapt their beliefs and expectations, and satisfiers of those expectations, within the conditions in which they find themselves (Lavoie, 2013).

John Kenneth Galbraith, a contributor to post-Keynesian theory, suggested that an understanding of power was critical for understanding the workings of business firms—which he suggests are institutions "that seek to control and supersede the market in order to expand the influence of its bureaucratic apparatus—what Galbraith labels the "technostructure" (Dunn & Pressman, 2008, p. 281-2). Importantly, Galbraith challenged privileging corporate considerations in government policy discussions rather than seeking policies that would serve the public good (Dunn & Pressman, 2008). In this way, heterodox economics disputes that unregulated markets are self-regulating and promote human welfare, instead suggesting that free markets can lead to de-stabilization and the inefficient distribution of resources (Lavoie, 2013).

Second, heterodox economists work from a holistic-centred rather than individual-centred model (Lavoie, 2013). For Institutionalists, economics are reflective of social institutions, and these social institutions reflect the dynamic interaction of cultural and political beliefs, attitudes, and preferences of humans (James & Mogab, 1998). Therefore, the object of focus for Institutionalists is how economies are impacted by the social norms and rules that comprise social institutions (Martinez-Alier, 2015).

Feminist thought also asserts a holistic-centred framework for examining market and non-market relations. Ultimately concerned with gender equality, feminist political theories generally recognize the ways in which gender is embedded within social, political, and economic frameworks (Brodie, 2008). For instance, feminists assert that mainstream economics mainly focuses on market relations, while largely ignoring the economic activities of nonmarket relations that are crucial to economies (Straussmann, 2013). Due to the gendered nature of work, women are disproportionately involved in nonmarket activities, such as reproduction and caring labour, and this area is largely understudied (Barker & Feiner, 2009; Straussmann, 2013). Branches of feminism also challenge false delineations of paid/unpaid labour, feminine/masculine, and public/private and call attention to the holistic well-being of all humans (Barker & Feiner, 2009; Power, 2004).

Heterodox economics also challenges the scarcity view of mainstream economics that is rooted in neoconservative and neoliberal thinking. For example, ecological economics argues that economic growth in the market is often associated with increasing flows of materials and energy that are neither environmentally sustainable, nor thought to contribute to the advancement of human well-being and potential (Martinez-Alier, 2015). For ecological economists, a diversity of values and needs should be taken into account in economic activity—and in such a framework it is understood that some goods are more valuable than others as they can only be satisfied with limited means. For instance, although water is a basic human need that can only be satisfied with water, human needs for participation, freedom, and identity can be satisfied in a multitude of ways (Martinez-Alier, 2015).

Economist Amartya Sen also challenges scarcity views of human needs by identifying the various entitlements and rights that humans can claim by virtue of being human. In Sen's view, economics should be about developing individual welfare by increasing his/her functioning and capabilities. Functioning is understood to be a person's desired states of being—such as being in good health, having education opportunities, and enjoying shelter (Kuklys & Robeyns, 2005). Capability is the full range of functions that are potentially available to the individual and are composed of basic human needs, as well as broader human activities which lead to security and development such as reading and engaging in civic duties (Pressman & Summerfield, 2002).

Intersection of Politics and Economics in Canada

Historically, three main parties have been represented in federal and provincial politics—with the more centrist Liberal Party currently in power, and the more right-wing Conservative Party serving as the official opposition. These two parties have consistently predominated in federal politics, alternately taking the reins of power at various times throughout Canadian history. Although the Liberal Party has enjoyed more electoral success, the Conservative Party was the founding political party after Confederation, and has experienced long periods in power and as the official opposition (Harrison, 2011). More left-wing, socialist policies have been represented nationally and provincially through the New Democratic Party of Canada (NDP) since the 1960s (Whitehorn, 2013).

Although the NDP has never governed federally, it has led several governments in various provinces, and has enjoyed particular success in the prairie regions (Whitehorn, 2013). For instance, Tommy Douglas, the architect of *Medicare* in Canada, was premier of Saskatchewan from 1961-71, and the first leader of the NDP (Whitehorn, 2013). Manitoba has had four provincial governments lead by the NDP, most recently lead by Greg Selinger from 2009-2016 (Whitehorn, 2013). Jared Wesley (2011) characterizes the political culture of the prairies as a “prairie paradox” in that all three provinces—Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba—have been influenced by, and politically employed, divergent cultural ideologies. He explains that the province of Alberta has been more greatly influenced by more individualistic, free market populism. In contrast, Manitoba has emphasized more moderate, centrist policies focused on cooperative partisanship among provincial elites. Conversely, Saskatchewan has emphasized collectivism through a ‘protectionist’ framework that highlights polarization with elites (Wesley, 2011; McGrane, 2012).

Conclusion

This section has shown that economic and political ideologies are interdependent and influence how nations address concerns of human well-being, resource distribution, and social welfare. By tracing the early origins of political and economic philosophies from the liberal and classical traditions to Marxist and socialist schools of thought revealed through heterodox economic principles, this chapter has shown how economic beliefs and attitudes are particularly linked attitudes regarding human behaviour, and such attitudes inform the socio-political world in which we live. In Canada, such political and economic attitudes have impacted the development of our national identity and the policies and practices of our governance structure.

Chapter 3: History of Social Welfare in Canada

Introduction

The story of social welfare is fundamentally the story of the relationship between individuals, families, and the state. In Western democracies the notion of the welfare state has had a contentious history, as it is linked with beliefs and attitudes about who is responsible for ensuring collective rights and responsibilities (Brown & Troutt, 2007; Pal, 1994). Although not technically a 'state', the welfare state has always been embedded within various systems of governance, polity, economics, and civil society in democratic societies (Pal, 1997). The non-profit sector, alternately known as the third sector, has been fundamental part of this social welfare development, and so it is necessary to chart the complex evolution of the welfare state in Canada through several chapters of our national history. This section outlines the historical evolution of social welfare policies and practices from the earliest contributions of Indigenous peoples, through two world wars, to conclude with describing the current era of retrenchment. Due to welfare's embeddedness within socio-economic and political systems, particular emphasis is on the racialized and gendered ways in which social welfare has operated within the Canadian context.

Indigenous Peoples and Social Welfare in Canada

Integral to charting the social welfare history of the nation that is now called Canada is outlining the unique contribution Indigenous peoples to the development of social welfare principles in this country, and how these contributions were interrupted by European imperialism. It is first important to emphasize that due to the limited scope of this thesis, I will only briefly touch on Indigenous worldviews within the social welfare context; however, other researchers have written extensively about Indigenous ways of being and knowing that would substantively enrich the brief outline here (see Monture-Angus, 1995; Poonwassie & Charter, 2001; Simpson, 2001).

Indigenous peoples both nationally and globally have distinctive tribal histories, languages, traditions, and patterns of social relations (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], 2015). To respect this diversity, caution is needed when discussing Indigenous peoples prior to European contact so as to not romantize or essentialize diverse cultures and ways of being. Moreover, as Leanne Simpson (2001) reveals, Indigenous ways of knowing and being are challenging to describe within the noun-based English language; therefore, can only be recognized by “respecting and recognizing the spiritual foundation of our knowledge” (p. 143). The spiritual foundation of Indigenous worldviews is based on a holistic relationship with the Creator and all of creation (Finkel, 2006: Poonwassie & Charter, 2001). For many traditional peoples philosophical concepts are revealed through circular symbols such as the Medicine Wheel and The Pimaatisiwin Circle, and convey the interconnectedness, interdependence, and unity of all of life (Poonwassie & Charter, 2001). In the various cultures represented in the Prairie region, Poonwassie and Carter (2001) explain how cultural norms cultivated supportive communities:

> non-interference, non-competitiveness, desire for harmony within the group and/or community, acceptance of responsibility for one's actions, acknowledgement of the wisdom of others, distancing of problems, emotional restraint, and sharing are among some of the most important values (p. 67).

Prior to European contact, Indigenous peoples lived primarily as hunter-gatherers, agriculturalists, and fishers (Finkel, 2006). Each of these socio-economic systems of governance were patterned in various ways. For instance, hunter-gatherers lived in a state-less, largely egalitarian systems where each member role a distinct but complementary role, whereas agriculturalists across the land were governed by loose confederations. Fishers living on the western coast lived in ranked societies ruled by powerful chiefs (Finkel, 2006). As stateless peoples rooted in holistic cultural values, Indigenous communities were governed by different notions of property and trade (Finkel, 2006). Sharing resources among the community was the norm, and was often considered a source of prestige and honour (Finkel, 2006). The principle of shared property (or usufruct) was also shared across territories as agreements between bands ensured that hunting and gathering territories, sacred medicinal lands, and peace territories would be shared spaces (Finkel, 2006). In terms of ensuring the welfare of Indigenous peoples, medicine healers were entrusted with the medical needs of a clan, generally without distinction. Although Finkel (2006) identified that that there was at times conflict between and within nations, clans predominately ensured that the elderly and infirm were cared for within a nation's means. These approaches to ensuring collective well-being were forcibly altered by European settlers who came and colonized the land and brought European imperialist policies and practices which privileged Euro-centric to approaches to social welfare (TRC, 2015)

When European settlers came to the land that is now called Canada, they did so under the auspices of the European conquest of 'inferior' and 'uncivilized' Indigenous peoples throughout the world (TRC, 2015). This conquest was legitimated by Christo-centric views that contended Indigenous peoples were being colonized for their own benefit. The Canadian Northwest, known as Rupert's land, was colonized later than Upper and Lower Canada. In the 1600s, the fur trade between Indigenous peoples and Europeans was separate from the government and characterized primarily by commercial relationships of mutual benefit (McNeil, 2007). These alliances and relationships would be formalized in numbered treaties between the Crown and the Indigenous nations of western and northern Canada (TRC, 2015). Although these treaties were predicated on the notion that two autonomous nations were negotiating as sovereign entities, this understanding eventually devolved into a power dynamic whereby the Crown took control of delineating and enforcing tribal rights and lands in order to better benefit incoming European settlers (RCAP, 1996; TRC, 2015). Through policies first enacted through the *Royal Proclamation of 1763*, and executed by the *Department of the Interior* (later named the *Department of Indian Affairs*), the Crown began to establish a power dynamic whereby it was the guarantor and enforcer of delineating tribal rights and lands of Indigenous peoples from those of the European settlers (RCAP, 1996).

By the time the R*oyal Proclamation of 1763* was written, various factors, such as the influx of European settlers, and the rising insecurity of Indigenous sustenance practices, the bargaining position of many Indigenous peoples became increasingly compromised as they became more dependent on the treaty gifts and payments from British authorities (RCAP, 1996). In order to ensure and protect treaty land rights, reserve tracts of land were apportioned to Indigenous nations and tribes by the Crown, through various pieces of legislation (RCAP, 1996; McGrath & Stevenson, 1996). However this 'protection' of geographic spaces was a means of establishing cultural, economic, and political control of Indigenous peoples by federal and church authorities who believed Indigenous peoples to be 'uncivilized' and in need of 'assistance' in order to assimilate into the white settler society (TRC, 2015). The enactment of the *Indian Act* in 1876, and its subsequent amendments, secured the transition from Indigenous peoples being recognized as distinct tribal nations negotiating with British imperial authorities, to that of inferior and incompetent wards of the mainstream colonial society (RCAP, 1996).

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) explains how many policies and practices of the Canadian state in regards to Indigenous persons was an act of "cultural genocide" as it sought to "destroy the political and social institutions of the targeted group" (p. 1). Lands were re-appropriated by the government by various means, such as forced relocation from resource-rich land to economically marginal reserves, and through the pass law system whereby all movement on or off reserve lands had to be approved by an Indian agent after an appropriate 'pass' was produced. Through the *Department of Indian Affairs* and the *Indian Act*, traditional governance arrangements were replaced by relatively powerless band councils. Cultural and spiritual practices, such as the Potlatch and the Sundance, were perceived as inferior and were banned. The *Indian Act* also legislated 'Indian' identity and consigned status and resources according to government dictates.

Social Welfare—1700s & 1800s

Prior to the British conquest of New France in 1713 in Acadia, early colonists from France carried over a feudal social system to Lower Canada (present day Quebec) in which the State, represented by the King and the Roman Catholic Church, was morally responsible to provide social services for citizens (Chappell, 2006). By 1688, bureaux des pauvres (offices of the poor) were set up in New France to provide alms for 'unemployables'—usually widows and children of unwed mothers (Finkel, 2006). In this way, the state provided the church with monies and the church then operated social service institutions.

The subsequent British conquest of the rest of the colonies in 1759 saw an increase in British immigration (Finkel, 2006).[1] In the British colonies of Upper Canada, British models and values about the 'deserving' and 'undeserving poor', based on Britain's poor laws, guided social

[1] It is important to note that despite this British conquest, the strong presence of French peoples throughout various parts Canada remains and greatly contributes to our bilingual heritage today (McGrath & Stephenson, 1996; Turner, 2009).

policy in the new colonies (Finkel, 2006; Hick, 2004). This narrative of ‘deservingness’ was influenced by Adam Smith’s ‘laissez-faire’ economic principles that were predominant in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Turner, 2009). With such views, the individual is responsible for securing her/his own needs; if a person fails to do so, it is due to personal failure (Turner, 2009). Related to the narrative of deservingness are beliefs about who is most eligible for social services by the state (Turner, 2009). As individuals are primarily responsible for ensuring her/his own self-interest, only certain conditions are acceptable for the state to intervene and meet those needs on the individual’s behalf.

The deservingness narrative was also influenced by Protestant ideologies that reinforced the belief that the individual must work hard to access success in this life and in the after-life (Chappell, 2006). With this view, prosperity and success was evidence of moral virtue and divine favour. Conversely, poverty was indicative of a sinful life in need of moral and spiritual salvation (Chappell, 2006)

As subsistence lifestyles were the norm for British North American citizens in the nineteenth century, the ‘standard of less eligibility’ would shape the development of ‘indoor relief’ in the form of houses of industry (Guest, 1997; Turner, 2009). These houses, modelled after the British workhouses and poorhouses, employed the policy that the standard of living of the individual must be less than the lowest paid labourer (Guest, 1997). These workhouses were primarily for those individuals who were not associated with a family unit and/or who were deemed the ‘honest poor’—impoverished by reasons of insanity, age, or immigration status (Guest, 1997). Such establishments provided a cheap source of labour for the emerging business class, and was understood to cultivate in the able-bodied the habits of industrial labour (Finkel, 2006; Guest, 1997). State funding was available in Upper and Lower Canada for such workhouses, and subsidies were provided to private charities.

There were also humanitarian groups who emerged during this time. Proponents of charitable action challenged the laissez-faire principles of the time and redefined 'neediness' as arising from circumstances beyond an individual's immediate control (Turner, 2009). Charitable organizations generally provided what was called 'outdoor relief' through the donation of money, food, or other necessary items to congregants and their families within their own homes (Guest, 1997). This outdoor relief often came in the form of hampers, clothing and fuel was also provided according to the beliefs at the time of those who were deemed as deserving. Embedded within this deservingness narrative was the belief in the sanctity of the traditional, patriarchal family unit.

Despite this concern with particular populations deemed as needy or worthy of government intervention, social welfare in the nineteenth century was still not considered an urgent matter federally and responsibility was still left to local governments (Turner, 2009). Under the *British North America Act of 1867*, only broad jurisdiction over matters of national interest was granted to the federal government; therefore, the oversight and distribution of social programs was mostly entrusted to the provinces (Beaudoin & Panneton, 2015). For many European settlers, family and the church were still the main sources of social support; however, this would change with the onset of the twentieth century and the growing realization that changing social realities were placing more and more pressure on the needs of local governments.

The 1900s

The onset of World War I saw a rise in the Social Gospel movement, which sought to apply Judeo-Christian principles to maintain a 'moral' Canadian society (Finkel, 2006). Connected to these principles was the Protestant work ethic, which held that work was a divine vocation; therefore work in the marketplace was connected to individual morality and religious experience (Delaney, 2009). Along with the family, the state was also seen as responsible for preserving and protecting the values and well-being of responsible, Christian citizens within wider society (Christie, 2000). Despite this over-arching framework, this movement saw a split in the Protestant churches over whether this responsibility should focus on individual moral reform (ie. prohibition), or through state-led policies that would ensure a minimum income and access to health services (ie. water and milk). The programs and policies of the latter movement subsequently came to be known as the *Social Service Council of Canada* (Finkel, 2006). As the moral principles encoded in the Social Gospel Movement also pertained to the family unit, the presumed nature and role of children in society began to change.

Welfare Policies for Vulnerable Groups

In the late 1880s the emergence of protective societies for children had begun (Finkel, 2006; Turner, 2009). Children began to be classified as the 'worthy' poor, and the state came to assert itself as the legal guardians of homeless children or children in physical or 'moral' risk at home (Finkel, 2006; Turner, 2009). In addition to the state adopting a co-ownership role along with parents to cultivate and maintain 'good' citizens (Finkel, 2006), the 'child saver movement' led by Protestant reformers such as J.J Kelso, would reflect a greater religious concern with morality (Christie, 2000). The early 1900s also saw a growing concern with the elderly as many elderly Canadians were applying for public relief (Chappell, 2006). The *Old Age Pension Act of*

1927 saw the establishment of pensions for the elderly through a joint federal-provincial partnership (Finkel, 2006; Guest, 1997). As Chappell (2006) reveals, this movement was important as it was one of the first substantive actions by the federal government to commit to social security in an on-going manner.

Labour and Community Development

The forces of industrialization and the social and economic challenges after World War I also began to change attitudes towards unemployment as unemployment was increasingly distinguished from a willingness to work. Several approaches were trying to address the need for increased economic capacity for workers and their families. Settlement houses, which had been established at the turn of century in Canada, provided programming to the poor and unemployed (Bellamy, 2005). Often operated by higher placed social reformers, programming focused on the development of democratic decision-making, neighbourhood education, support, and assistance (Chappell, 2009; Bellamy, 2005). Literature suggests that settlement houses pioneered contemporary social work practices, as well as community development frameworks focused on local citizen empowerment (Finkel, 2006; Chappell, 2009).

The awareness of unsafe working conditions was also growing and increasingly being challenged by trade unions who protested and demanded higher standards of living, income security programs, and better wages (Chappell, 2006). One of the most significant Canadian protests, the Winnipeg General Strike, occurred in Winnipeg, Manitoba in 1919 (Meighen, 2005). Although the success of the protests are questionable due to the fact that the union leaders were jailed for their protests, Meighen (2005) asserts that the strike action did politicize labour issues at provincial and federal levels. By the 1920s every province, excepting Prince Edward Island, had legislation on the worker's compensation for poor or unsafe working conditions

(Chappell, 2006). By 1930, rates of unemployment were as high as thirty percent, and meant that the Canadian government could no longer refuse to take some measures to address unemployment in social policies and programs (Campbell, 2012).

Direct and indirect forms of relief were provided by the government—either directly through cash or vouchers for household or personal necessities, or indirectly through government funded work projects (Chappell, 2009). By 1940, the *Unemployment Insurance Act* passed and meant that the federal government took over jurisdiction of unemployment from the provinces and territories. Unemployment insurance (UI) would become Canada's first large scale income security—covering 4.6 million Canadians in its first year (Chappell, 2009; Guest, 1997).

The aftereffects of the First World War also saw the enactment of various policies that ensured that veterans and their families were primary stakeholders in any relief efforts from the federal government. Further, Campbell (2000) explains how the organized protests and unorganized resistance of veterans after the war was instrumental in developing wider cultural support for the idea that social welfare was an inherent right by virtue of citizenship. As Campell (2000) notes:

> …to have certain rights as a citizen…an individual had to fulfill certain duties and expectations of a citizen. The more one could identify oneself as a true citizen of Canada, the greater degree of entitlement to social and economic benefits (p. 127).

Campbell (2000) also highlights how this narrative of citizenship was intertwined with masculinity, as calls for aid and assistance to veterans was deemed to not impede the image of independent and strong heads of households as it was framed within a discourse of contract and entitlements. Further, claims upon the state, and subsequent relief administered by the state, was made by drawing upon gendered family arrangements whereby men were breadwinners and women were wives and mothers (Campbell, 2000; 2012). In this way the security of the state was tied to the safety and stability of the home (Campbell, 2000).

Gender and Social Welfare

Women have been early supporters of the extension of social welfare rights in Canada, particularly those for women and children (Chappell, 2006). For instance in New France, Finkel (2006) notes that the informal pay of midwives indicated the presence of a voluntary, informal sector alongside the state and church. With the British conquest of New France, and the arrival of more immigrants from Britain, wives of men from the wealthier business class began to form charitable agencies (Finkel, 2006). As women without a form of paid employment, this social welfare activism often provided an opportunity for them to participate in public life. As the nature of welfare provision developed, men could be seen in more leadership roles, with women entering into the front-line caring tasks of looking after the poor, orphans, prostitutes, aged and insane (Finkel, 2006).

By the 1800s, women's involvement in charitable and volunteer groups expanded to national organizations (Chappell, 2006; Christie, 2000). By the 1920s, women's rights movements in Canada were gaining success in lobbying governments for extended legal and political rights of women, and for a number of social causes such as mother's pensions, minimum wage, prison reform, and health reform (Chappell, 2006; Christie, 2000).

Christie (2000) highlights how women during the 1900s employed various strategies to advocate for reform. Although never overtly challenging the 'bread-winner' ideal, some female reformers partnered with labour unions to advocate for state benefits; child welfare advocates sought to preserve the familial unit; others equated the right to relief through equating citizenship with motherhood (Christie, 2000). Campbell (2012) reveals how this last group of reformers were generally middle-class women who equated their roles as respectable Anglo-Canadian wives and mothers with patriotic citizens of the state who were entitled to certain rights and benefits.

Mother's pensions, (later called Mother's Allowances), were the first public assistance programs in Canada to address national economic challenges by aiming support at wives and mothers (Christie, 2000; Finkel, 2006). Such efforts were bolstered by women reformers who framed their entitlements through the accepted female roles of marriage and motherhood (Campbell, 2012; Christie, 2000). Although certain categories of women, such as unwed mothers, were unable to convincingly make this argument, Christie (2000) contends that both middle class and working class women championed the bread-winner ideal and petitioned the state for more interventionist policies. Gendered roles regarding femininity and legitimate paid work were also evidenced in policy actions such as the elimination of Unemployment Insurance (UI) for married women in the early 1950s. Although women lobbied to have UI benefits reinstated, UI would still be characterized by societal perceptions of 'valid' paid labour—male labour characterized by full-time, full-year work (Christie, 2000; Cohen & Pulkingham, 2009).

Indigenous Peoples and Early Social Welfare

The language of entitlements and rights was also embedded within a particular national, racial, and gender identity. To be a good citizen was to be a married Anglo-Protestant male (Campbell, 2000; Stubbs, 2012). In this way, the nation-building process in Canada privileged the citizenship rights of a select group of individuals rather than expanding citizenship rights, and thus social welfare provision, for all residents.

Racialized relief policies also sought to control Indigenous communities and assimilate them into the Canadian mainstream marketplace (Finkel, 2006). Such policies, reflected in imperialistic legislation such as the *Indian Act*, privileged the rights of the individual subject over that of the collective (RCAP, 1996). In this way, Indigenous collectivist identity was recast to that of an individual 'Indian' who was now a ward of the state. Legal categories determining 'Indian' identity and differentiating between 'native', 'status', 'non-status', and 'Metis' became defined by the state and outlined in the Indian Act (Bourassa, McKay-McNabb & Hampton, n.d). The state could then determine when and how a person could receive service services from the state and/or private sources. For instance, Finkel (2006) describes how the *Medicine Chest Clause* of Treaty Six between the Canadian government and the Cree Nations of Saskatchewan and Alberta provided limited health care for those individuals within these nations defined as 'natives'—contrary to Cree understandings that health services were to be provided for all Cree peoples. Later policies of enfranchisement, or gaining full citizenship, for Indigenous persons meant that they needed to surrender their Indian identity and status, and to prove that they had become fully 'civilized' according to Euro-Western dictates (Bourassa et al., n.d).

For Indigenous women these multiple marginalizations were even more keenly pronounced. The process of enfranchisement outlined in the Indian Act was not only paternalistic, but also disrupted traditional Indigenous kinship structures that were often matriarchal. Based on the European patriarchal family model, the *Indian Act* only recognized Indigenous women in relationship to that of her husband. Even upon enfranchisement, 'Indian' women were not granted full citizenship. For instance, from 1876 to 1951, "women who married Indian men and remained on the reserve were denied the right to vote in band elections, to hold elected office, or to participate in public meetings" (Bourassa et al., n.d, p. 26). Moreover, the Family Allowance that was introduced in 1945, often noted as the first 'universal' social security program in Canada, was not available to Indigenous mothers until a couple of years later in 1947 (Cohen & Pulkingham, 2009; Siltanen, 2002).

For Indigenous children and families, the government's paternalistic stance would have particularly detrimental repercussions. Residential schools would become a primary means of this cultural genocide as the government envisioned the 'civilizing' process would absorb distinct Indigenous identities "into the body politic," thus relieving itself of its obligations to Indigenous peoples and to the treaties (TRC, 2015, p. 3). Catholic and Protestant churches maintained residential schools under policies whereby Indigenous children would purportedly be 'civilized' and converted to Euro-Christian values through industrial work and Christian teaching (TRC, 2015). Residential schools operated in Canada for over 100 years, and children in these schools experienced physical, emotional and sexual abuse, neglect, and death in devastating numbers (TRC, 2015).

Pre and Post World War Immigration

Canada has also had several waves of immigration that have greatly influenced its historical legacy and social welfare trajectory. As was previously discussed, the first wave of Europeans came to Canada from England and France to gain land and resources. The second wave of European migration occurred in the 1880s in the Canadian prairies when tracts of land were made available to other Europeans outside of France or Britain (Christenson, 2009). Of those immigrants, approximately 70 percent were German, and 10 percent of Dutch descent (Christenson, 2009). Subsequent waves of immigration saw migrants fleeing poor socio-economic conditions, or religious and political persecution (Christenson, 2009). Many groups such as Ukrainians, Germans, Scandanvians, Mennonites, and Hutterites settled in the Canadian

West and formed religious and ethno-cultural communities within their areas of settlement and often stirred British settler's fears of the "dangerous foreigner"(Walter, 2003, p. 43).

This fear would underpin Canadian immigration policies until the 1960s and would privilege settlers from Britain, the United States, and Scandinavia (Christenson, 2009; Thompson, 1991). In contrast, Chinese men and Europeans from Southern, Eastern, or Central Europe faced prejudice and discrimination during the periods leading up to and including both world wars (Christenson, 2009; Thompson, 1991). Such immigrants were often relegated to the lower-paying, more menial jobs found in work camps (Walter, 2003). Within such camps, efforts to 'civilize' and 'educate' also occurred in order to shape and mold "into the image of proper Anglo-Canadian citizens" (Walter, 2003, p. 44).

Social Welfare—Post World War II

The post-World War II era saw an increasing expansion of government concern, both through policy and spending, on social services (Tillotson, 1997). Some scholars suggest that concern for raising the standard of living has always been tied to the economic processes of industrialization and nation-building. For instance, Christie (2000) explains that social relief policies of the time were geared towards "the imperatives of national economic efficiency" and to "affirm the laws of the marketplace" (p. 310). Cohen and Pulkingham (2009) posit that the economic crisis after the upheaval of the Great Depression and World War II dealt the capitalist system a blow, and this system was poorly equipped to address public needs. As such, the government began to adopt a greater role in regulating market mechanisms in order to protect citizens from the inherent risks in the market economy.

Clearly, a changed perception regarding "the sources of security in an insecure world" began to emerge for many Canadians (Banting, 2005, p. 421). Social spending began to be embraced as an equalizing and stabilizing force against such distress both ideologically and politically (Banting, 2005; Hick, 2004). For instance, Blake (1997) notes that there was a shift in citizens' attitudes towards redistribution policies whereby public services delivered on behalf of the state were seen not as privileges, but as entitlements and social rights for all citizens regardless of economic advantage (Blake, 1997). Hence, the "warfare state" began to be replaced by the "welfare state" (Hick, 2004, p. 46).

Policy documents also reflected changing ideology of the time period. Documents such as Leonard Marsh's *The Report on Social Security for Canada*, influenced by the British *Beveridge Report*, focused on areas of employment, healthcare, disability, old age, and advocated for more income support for families (Cohen & Pulkingham, 2009; Siltanen, 2002). Finkel (2006) notes that the *Marsh Report*, although still encoded with hierarchical gender-role divisions, introduced a comprehensive program of welfare entitlements and advocated for government commitment to ensure high levels of employment. In the 1960s, national policies prioritized redistribution policies through such federal programs as the *Canada Pension Plan* and *Medical Care Act* in order to ensure a measure of social and economic stability and well-being for citizens (Blake, 1997).

The push for universal medical care in Canada was led by Thomas Douglas in Saskatchewan through the *Hall Report*, which examined Western European models of healthcare. Interestingly, such efforts for universal health services was not supported by any recognized organization of health professionals in Canada at the time, excepting the Nurses' Association of Saskatchewan, where *Medicare* was already an established program (Finkel, 2006). For many such health professionals, *Medicare* was seen to curtail the freedom of doctors to operate their own businesses, and asserted that competitiveness and trading within the industry would be impacted negatively. Trade unions, social worker, farmers' federations, and the United Church were all in favor of *Medicare* as representatives asserted that a universal service would de-stigmatize physical and mental health services (Finkel, 2006).

By the 1950s and 1960s, policies regarding the division of responsibility under federal or provincial jurisdiction changed to encourage the establishment and expansion of these new national programs (Department of Finance Canada, 2014). The Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) was introduced in 1966 and replaced the conditional grants the federal government had initially provided to the provinces in order to help pay for social assistance programs (Rice, 2005). The CAP supported approximately half the programs for single-parent families, daycare costs, family counseling, persons with disabilities, or other persons with low to modest incomes (Rice, 2005).

The economic climate during this period was greatly influenced by the policies of economist John Keynes. As previously discussed, Keynes asserted that the fiscal and monetary intervention of the state was necessary in order to smooth out the inconsistencies of the capitalist economic cycle. To this end, Guest (1997) notes that the state became the largest employer by raising billions of dollars in taxation revenue. Tillotson (1997) reveals how societal acceptance of increased taxation came to be seen "as a feature of citizenship in the welfare state" (p. 141).

Despite these positive developments in welfare provision, scholars such as Siltanen (2002) caution against romanticized narratives of a "Golden Era" of post-war welfare provision (p. 396). She makes a careful distinction between social welfare and social rights by outlining how the development of the welfare state in Canada has always been interconnected with nation-building, rather than a commitment to expanding citizenship rights. Cohen and Pulkingham (2009) similarly recognize this seismic shift in the nature and role of the state in addressing societal needs was not altogether altruistic as the interests of the dominant groups in Canada were still paramount. For instance, the authors highlight how Crown corporations funded infrastructure projects that could deliver public and social services that private and corporate interests were unable to mobilize during this time. Similarly, Frankel (2006) highlights how social concerns were always balanced with the demands from the business community to promote economic growth and efficiency within the economy.

Era of Retrenchment

The expansion of the welfare state continued until the 1970s. Various socio-economic factors, such as rising inflation, increased unemployment, and an economic downturn in the 1980s, have all been cited as contributing to a decrease in government revenues and an increase in cuts to social programs (Hick, 2004). Further, White (2003) asserts that as we have transitioned from an industrial society to a post-industrial society, this has reverberations nationally and internationally.

Nationally, the 1970s saw substantive reductions in the economic commitments of many federal programs from formerly more comprehensive programs. For instance, the *Family Allowance* program was altered from a universal program to a selective program. This meant that while the federal government offered a refundable child tax benefit, they taxed back the benefits to those earning over a certain income, and then introduced a benefit based on income level and number of dependents (Rice, 2005). In 1989, the federal government decided to recover taxation benefits through *Old Age Security* (OAS) by those who had annual incomes over $50,000 (Rice, 2005). Further, to meet increased demands of aging population, the federal government increased the amount of income that must be contributed to the *Canada Pension Plan* (Rice, 2005). The federal government also made changes to the federal-provincial/territorial method of distributing and transferring funds, initially called the *Canada Assistance Plan* (CAP), and this has had significant impacts for health and social service provision provincially and territorially. Such changes in health and social transfers will be further explored in the Chapter 4 discussion of third sector funding dynamics in Canada.

Scholars have debated the reasons for the era of retrenchment and fiscal restraint that still continues today. Two main concerns are cited as prominent: neoliberalism and globalization. Blake (1997) notes that the new socially fiscal policies and practices reflected a simultaneous shift in economic decisions and political ideology. This shift is characterized by neo-liberalism, and as previously discussed, prioritizes the needs of the individual citizen, and sees this citizen as a responsible, self-determining entity whose well-being and social security is best assured through limited state intervention in market activities (Cohen & Pulkingham, 2009).

Using micro-data from two national surveys, Habibov and Fan (2008) present evidence which illustrates that the era of welfare retrenchment has contributed to a greater gap in income inequality in Canada. Although factors of low unemployment, and rising market income were shown to mitigate some income inequality effects, the authors note an overall trend which demonstrates a greater gap in social outcomes between the rich and the poor in Canada. In terms of service provision, Bode and Brandson (2014) raise the concern that neo-liberal policies of market regulation in Canada have increasingly implicated the non-profit sector into co-producing and co-regulating human services through contract and fee-for-service arrangements.

Globalization is predicated on the neoliberal conviction that nations can be strengthened through the internationalization of production, trade liberalization, and transnational economic integration (White, 2003; Wilson & Whitemore, 2000). Although globalization has been championed as a more open system to promote development and personal empowerment, the integration of global markets has not necessarily led to ensuring the human rights and security of the most marginalized (Brysk, 2002). Increases in global economic integration, or globalization, have also significantly contributed to retrenchment of social welfare. For instance, Banting (2005) suggests that in Canada today, security is no longer tied to economic stability and protection *from* change, but rises from an ability to respond and adapt to a rapidly changing global economy, or in other words "the capacity *to* change" (p. 422). In order to adapt to this rapidly changing economy, national economies are compelled to be more "flexible" and compete in the international arena with other state economies and transnational corporations (Wilson & Whitmore, 2000, p. 14). The de-regulation of labour legislation, promotion of exports, privatization of public enterprises, and cuts to social programs have all been cited as factors influencing retrenchment of social welfare in Canada (Banting, 2005; Hick, 2004; Wilson & Whitmore, 2000). Further, White (2003) suggests that globalization has introduced an emphasis on production flexibility, whereby increasing amounts of employees in knowledge and service-based sectors must adapt to the ever-changing needs of the workplace.

Conclusion

This chapter highlights how social welfare origins in the European colonial project gradually made way for changes in citizen's attitudes whereby the state was increasingly perceived as responsible for maintaining human security in an ever uncertain world. The culmination of such federal policies and practices, what is now referred to the Keynesian welfare state, has now yielded to an increasingly global, neoliberal welfare state characterized by austerity and retrenchment. This chapter also attempts to complicate the historical record by revealing the development of the social welfare state in Canada has had been a variable and uneven process as entitlements and rights have not always applied equally to all groups living within Canada's borders. In this way, the social welfare system in Canada has both contained and constrained others other systems of inequality such as gender, class, and ethnicity.

Chapter 4: **Non-profits and the Third Sector**

Introduction

In Western democracies, responsibility for addressing citizen's social and economic needs has not been borne by the state alone. From social welfare's earliest beginnings, non-profit organizations have contributed to national efforts to meet and fulfill citizen's needs. Despite wide consensus on non-profits being value-based organizations, there is very little consensus on what substantively distinguishes and defines them. This is complicated by the fact that non-profits have steadily evolved and shifted methods and modes of operation depending on the national framework in which they operate. This chapter provides a literature overview of the theoretical and definitional origins of non-profits, with particular emphasis on the intersection of economic activity between non-profits and state frameworks. Then, consideration turns to examining the nexus between non-profits, civil society, and the development of the third sector. The chapter subsequently provides an overview of the literature on third sector—government funding dynamics—identifying both the challenges and opportunities within such partnerships. Following this, funding partnerships within the Canadian context are identified, with particular attention to the structure of government funding mechanisms. The chapter concludes with a description of the demographic characteristics of the third sector nationally and regionally, as well as the economic and social implications of non-profit—government funding arrangements for service provision.

Origins and Functions of Non-profits

Due the prevailing view in mainstream economics that humans are primarily self-interested creatures and guided by profit-making decisions, the financial activity of non-profit organizations was not considered a worthy object of study until the 1970s (Steinberg, 2006).

Earlier neoclassical thinking was predicated on the notion that under the free enterprise system, national economies trade goods and services in mostly efficient and functional ways (Steinberg, 2006). As such, it was generally accepted knowledge that governments had an ancillary role to play in markets that had less than optimal levels of competitiveness (Steinberg, 2006). The existence of non-profits in democratic contexts created a conundrum for economists as it became evident that such organizations were enlisted to step into gaps that the market or the government were purportedly to fill.

For this reason, the rise of non-profit organizations in the economy was initially conceived and explained through the “three-failures theory;” that is, non-profit organizations were born out of failures in the market and government sectors (Steinberg, 2006, p. 119). The first ‘failure’ concerns the failure of the market to adequately redistribute public goods and services, or to exclude certain consumers from certain goods and services (Donoghue, 2010; Steinberg, 2006). The second failure is due to governments who fail to adequately deliver the quality or quantity of collective good and services in accordance with the wishes of the electorate (Steinberg, 2006). The third failure refers to contract failures between for-profit firms and the government, and when such arrangements highlight disparate information and communication flows regarding the quality or quantity of for-profit service provision (Hansmann, 1980). Hansmann (1980) suggests that in such instances non-profits have the capability to be a more trustworthy contract partner than for-profits.

Whether these failures are due to markets, governments, and/or contracts, such explanations are predicated on non-profit organizations being created to fill in the ‘gaps’ when markets and/or governments provide inadequate levels of goods and services (Steinberg, 2006). Lester Salamon’s early research into the voluntary sector in the United States added one more ‘failure’ to the ‘three-failures’ explanation by explaining how voluntary organizations can also fail to adequately provide public services for various reasons such as philanthropic paternalism, particularism, and philanthropic amateurism (Steinberg, 2006).

In terms of non-profit—government partnership arrangements, Smith and Gronbjerg (2006) categorize perspectives, such as the ‘three failures’ origin theory of non-profits, as supply/demand perspectives, and suggest these perspectives presume a dominant market economy supported by democratic institutions with varying degrees of competition and cooperation. Other models are also located within such perspectives, for example, the “4 C’s model” asserts that third-sector–government arrangements are predicated on the level of congruence between these two sectors, and may result in either cooperative, competitive, complementary, or co-optative partnership dynamics (Zimmer, 2010, p. 209). Young (2000; as cited in Zimmer, 2010) similarly coded partnership dynamics in terms of supplementary, complementary, or adversarial relations.

Despite this discourse calculating the origins of non-profits, in reality there is very little consensus on what actually defines a non-profit agency. Salamon and Anheier (2006) assert that this due to non-profit agencies evolving within different social, political, economic, and cultural histories, environments, and ideologies. Further, non-profits operate at local, national, and international levels of society and this level often frames the function and scope of the agency, as well as shapes the terminology employed (Anheier & List, 2005). Non-profits may invariably be called ‘voluntary’, ‘charitable’, ‘non-governmental’, ‘civil society’ or the ‘third sector.’ The standard-operational definition, a classification system used internationally, defines non-profit organizations as those that are organized, private, non-profit distributing, self-governing, and voluntary (Hall et al., 2005; Itzkow, Kreklewetz & White, 2002).

At the local level, Salamon and Anheier (2006) assert the oldest concept is rooted in the English common law tradition, and refers to organizations characterized as inherently ‘charitable’, ‘non-profit,’ or ‘voluntary’ in their provision of services to the general public or to those who were disadvantaged within the community. The key distinguishing element of such institutions today is they generally do not distribute surpluses to members and directors, and retain and/or reinvest profits back into their organization (Salamon & Anheier, 2006; Steinberg, 2006). The concept of the ‘social economy’ or ‘social enterprise’ finds its roots in continental Europe and defines non-profits primary as economic institutions characterized by cooperatives, social enterprises, and mutual aid societies undergirded by an ethics of member service, democratic decision-making, autonomous management, and person-centred ahead of focus on profits (Salamon & Anheier, 2006).

Smith and Gronbjerg (2006) identify how these definitions of non-profits often focus on the interdependence of government and non-profits, and how government policy shapes social movements and non-profits over time. They locate such focus within a regime or (neo)institutional model of non-profit—government relations that understand the government and non-profit sector as “mutually re-enforcing” (p. 236). As such, neo-institutional models generally highlight the dynamic of hybridity—noting various amalgamations of public-private relationships reflect competing institutional logics, missions, and values (Smith, 2014). Terms such as “the welfare mix” and the “welfare regime” are employed in order to analyze the production and delivery of social services within various governance arrangements from a public policy perspective (Zimmer, 2010, p. 206).

Smith and Gronbjerg (2006) suggest that regime and neo-institutional models have the ability to explain contrasts regionally within a specific country as well as between different countries. For instance, social origins theory argues that state—non-profit relationships emerged from, and operate within, a nation's specific political, cultural, and socio-economic history (Donoghue, 2010, Salamon & Anheier, 2006). One of the earliest scholars under the regime model was Gosta Epsing-Anderson. In the *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Epsing-Anderson (1990) identifies three types of social welfare regimes in democratic societies—liberal, social democratic, and corporatist/conservative—according to the socio-economic and political landscape of the country in which they exist. Scholars have since critiqued Epsing-Anderson's conceptual emphasis on static categorizations and have begun to recognize national welfare regimes evolve and change according to various socio-economic and political factors. For instance, Epsing-Anderson first placed Canada within the liberal-residual tradition; however, scholars such as Habibov and Fan (2008) have countered this assertion by outlining Canada's most recent transition from a mixed welfare regime to a neoliberal welfare regime.

Civil Society and Non-Profits

Civil society as a term gained prominence in the central European struggle to overthrow state socialism in the 1980s and 1990s (Salamon & Anheier, 2006). As Anheier and List (2005) note, "Civil society cuts across disciplinary boundaries and brings into focus some of the long-standing and nagging questions about the relationship between economy, polity and society." Critical to the concept of civil society is the relationship of citizens to the state, and this relationship occurs at local, regional, national, and international levels of society (Kjellman & Harpviken, 2010). At the local level, civil society organizations often act as an intermediary between the state and local citizens in local community development practices, conflict resolution, and service provision (Paffenholz, 2010). Regionally and nationally, civil society organizations can also act as intermediaries who promote participatory citizen engagement and socialization, advocate and communicate on behalf of citizens, monitor state activities to ensure accountability, and provide various social services (Spurk, 2010).

Literature on global civil society is increasingly shedding light on state-building policies that have privileged democratic engagement modelled after Western liberal policies, and the impact of such policies on civil society practices (Kjellman & Harpviken, 2010). In international development studies, critical scholars have revealed the Western neoliberal perspective framework that many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) operate, and assert that such frameworks reinforce the historical imperialist paradigm (Kjellman & Harpviken, 2010; Paffenholz, 2010). Within such a paradigm, civil society can be seen as the mechanism of domination by the Global North in the Global South (Pugh, 2005; Salamon & Anheier, 2006). Further, critical scholars such as McGinty (2015), Paffenholz (2015), and Kappler (2015) are also challenging the framing of 'local' and 'international' as binary oppositions in civil society discourses and point to the ways in which the local and international spheres are embedded within politico-economic, social, and cultural spaces in which they operate. As with the terminology of NGOs, the concept of global civil society invites analysis to move beyond the notion of the nation-state and national society, to examine and critique elements of globalization and transnationalism within political, cultural and socio-economic spheres (Anheier & List, 2005)

The concept of civil society also intersects with peacebuilding. In transformative peacebuilding, civil society is considered integral to peacebuilding work as non-state actors are best positioned to address the root causes and relationships integral to building sustainable peace within a society (Paffenholz, 2010). Critical peacebuilding also sees civil society as an essential component of building more equitable societies. Rather than see civil society as an "an alternative service delivery supplier when the government is not able to deliver," focus is on the emancipatory potential of civil society—particularly on how gender, race, class and other social stratifications require structural changes within society both globally and locally (Paffenholz, 2010, p. 59).

Civil Society and the Third Sector

Non-profit organizations are now seen as part of wider civil society and crucial to delivering and governing social welfare programs and policies in contemporary societies (Anheier and List, 2005; Hull, 2011). In this way civil society organizations are seen to form a third set of institutions, or a 'third sector', that are positioned as intermediaries between the private, market economies (the first sector), and the public, state realm (the second sector) (Anheier & List, 2005; Zimmer, 2010). The term the 'third sector' was first coined by Israeli-American sociologist Amitai Etzioni, but came to prominence when the *Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs* (the *Filer Commission*) referenced the term in their report in 1973 (Anheier & List, 2005). The third sector also serves as a point of intersection between the informal social spheres, such as the family, that are crucial to socio-economic analysis and discussions of social welfare. As Gibbon (2011) notes, the third sector is the "blurred space where the complex and negotiated boundaries between state, civil society, family, and markets are played out" (Gibbon, 2011, p. 83).

Non-profits as Value-based Organizations

Today, the non-profit social service sector covers a wide range of public services such as healthcare, education, community capacity development, counselling, employment, and/or other public services (Hasenfeld, 2010). Although there a primary transaction that occurs—a service that is provided—such occupations are often typified by a "sustained emotional investment" within an organizational setting (Ducharme, Knudson & Roman, 2008, p. 82). For this reason, human service occupations, are often referred to as ‘helping’ or ‘caring’ professions as they typically privilege the client-worker relationship (Ducharme et al., 2008).

Many social service employees who enter such fields are not simply looking for monetary rewards, but are intrinsically motivated by certain values or ideals that compel them to contribute to the public good (Benz, 2005). Jarem Sawatsky (2008) describes this value orientation as a ‘justpeace ethic’ distinguished by a commitment to interconnectedness, particularity, responsibility, and empowerment. For instance, Davis (2007) suggests that engaging in social work, by definition, is to be concerned with change—both within the individual and in the social sphere—in order to address social inequalities and promote transformation.

In terms of transformative peacebuilding, civil society engagement and community development are often key areas of focus. Rather than a ‘service-only’ oriented model, which primarily is an orientation to addressing gaps in unmet needs, a community development approach goes beyond this and “looks around for things or potential to cultivate or resources to build with” (Homan, 2011). With this kind of peacebuilding lens, community development moves beyond service actions which perpetuate need and works from a strengths-based orientation to the community so that already existing resources are recognized and augmented (Homan, 2011). For professionals engaged in non-profit human service work, this value-orientation is characterized by several principles: 1) it privileges the inherent dignity and worth of all people and their relationship to the environment; 2) it focuses on quality of life issues that seek to develop capacity within people and communities through empowerment, resource provision, and equity; and 3) it is rooted in the belief that all people should be respected for having unique abilities and should have maximum opportunities to determine the trajectory of their own lives (Homan, 2011).

This value-orientation can lead to a very rewarding experience for both clients and employees, but it can also bring to the fore personal, collective, and systemic issues. Research shows that factors such as disparate client needs, exposure to abusive and/or violent episodes, increased workloads, and inadequate resources can all influence the dynamic of the work environment and lead to employee exhaustion and emotional distancing (Ducharme et al., 2008; Bahner & Berkel, 2007). However, research also shows that conflict and crisis can also provide the space and opportunity to raise awareness of the need to re-assess, and perhaps change, dominant patterns that have such negative impacts (Homan, 2011).

In outlining the value basis of non-profit work, it is also important to note that this sector is overwhelmingly female-dominated. In Canada, women comprise three quarter of the nonprofit work sector (Kosney & MacEachen, 2010). The caring and helping orientation that underlies the non-profit sector has been linked to feminist principles of "collaboration, equality, participation, and valuing of people's experience's (Wilson & Whitemore, 2000, p. 127). Such contributions have opened up space to examine how both monetary and nonmonetary resources can influence personal and collective well-being. However, some researchers point out that the emotionally challenging nature of social service provision may also be exacerbated by the fact that nonprofit work is gendered. For instance, Kosney and MacEachen (2010) posit that invisible nature of such emotionally demanding jobs may be traced back to the invisible nature of physical and emotional labour traditionally undertaken in the home. They suggest that as work in the home has historically been the domain of females, this may be connected to why working under emotional stressors has been undervalued in the caring professions. In this way, such work may be considered 'natural' and not posing unnecessary risks for both employees and society at large.

Third Sector—Government Funding Dynamics

With the era of retrenchment in the 1980s and 1990s in many Western democracies, there has been a co-occurring rise of contracting agreements between governments and third sector organizations. Although literature examining third sector—government funding relationships is still emerging, there is a mixed response. For instance, Brown and Troutt (2004) discuss how government—non-profit funding relationships can be positive and collaborative if there are certain shared features —such as commitment to a participative process and a common mission focus. Further, Rekart (1993) argues that a government who is focused on positive aspects of funding partnerships—such as increasing a non-profit agency's credibility and offering communities greater reflexivity in meeting emerging social needs—can greatly contribute to more decentralized, participative democracy.

Smith (2010; 2014) highlights how the third sector is increasingly becoming distinguished by its 'hybrid' structure—meaning that such organizations respond to the new restructuring of government contracts by adapting in both similar and dissimilar ways to the state. For instance, non-profits are increasingly becoming more bureaucratic institutions guided by professionalized boards of directors, risk management principles, and efficient management structures (Smith, 2010). However, third sector agencies contest and challenge these developments as well by innovating and offering creating solutions that offer greater alignment with social commitment values. Smith (2014) asserts that such hybrid forms of organizational structure are sites of both contestation and integration, and as such, can reveal structural innovation.

Conversely, research also illustrates how third sector's increasing reliance on limited government funds is problematic in several ways. First, third sector—government funding models originated in a hierarchical 'principal-agent', or 'funder-fundee' pattern (Smith, 2010). This is due to the fact that as governments are guided by the election cycle, they are typically interested in providing funds for specific social issues that arise among the general electorate. As such, funding models "are typically organized around the priority of funders as opposed to the priorities or mission of applicants" (Scott, 2003, p. 16).

Second, such vertical power dynamics allow government funders to set strict eligibility criteria for funding recipients based on standardized models that may not adequately capture the services that some third sector organizations provide, or hope to provide, with the funds (Levasseur & Phillips, 2009; Scott, 2003). Smith (2010) notes how such strict eligibility criteria can be rooted in economic and political factors as policies of fiscal restraint place demands on governments to justify their allocation decisions when demand for funding often exceeds the supply. Once agencies are awarded grants or contracts, research shows that accountability and reporting criteria can place additional administrative burdens on third sector agencies—diverting key resources and staff from key programs (Eakin, 2007; MacKinnon et al., 2012; Scott, 2003).

Third, strict eligibility criteria can cultivate a competitive funding dynamic between various third sector agencies. Levasseur and Phillips (2009) explain how in the era of social welfare retrenchment relatively unconditional grants by governments gave way to project funding that is awarded through a competitive process. This competitive process is highlighted by the fact that there are often insufficient funds to go around. MacKinnon and colleagues (2012) further highlight how government funders have contradictory priorities as government contracts are often awarded on the basis of certain conditions, or contribution agreements in which agencies are required to partner with others; however, due to limited resources, these same agencies are compelled to vie for the same contracts.

Fourth, research has shown that current funding models and reporting structures can contribute to an agency veering away from initial its initial mission and values, what is often referred to as 'mission drift'. As the predominate organizational focus of non-profit organizations is to be responsive to local concerns and particular marginalized groups, this focus can contrast with the governments' prioritization of meeting larger societal needs more efficiently (Smith, 2010).

Even when agencies do not experience mission drift, the variability in priorities between funder and fundee can highlight discrepancies between the two parties when measuring and evaluating reporting outcomes. For instance, in her study Rekart (1993) revealed how agency directors reported feeling their work was unsubstantiated within government frameworks. Similarly, in a study by Scott (2003) one director shared:

> I see it as the government having adopted a commerce model where groups are having to prove their market relevance all the time – so you are not justifying yourself in terms of output or quality – but by simple denominators of dollars or numbers of people, which are crude indicators (p. 14).

Five, studies have shown that government funders often adopt a targeted, project-based approach to programs on an increasingly shorter term basis (MacKinnon et al., 2012; Scott, 2003). The inadequacy of funds and shorter timeframes can mean that third sector organizations will face capacity issues that threaten program viability and agency sustainability (Eakin, 2007, Hall et al. 2005; MacKinnon et al., 2012). Capacity challenges are also revealed by administrative delays in the funding approval process, which endangers agency priorities and programming (Levasseur & Phillips, 2009).

Third Sector—Government Funding Dynamics in Canada

In contemporary Canada, the third sector is increasingly seen as crucial in both economic and social realms. The *Satellite Account of Non-profit Institutions and Volunteering in Canada* found that in 2007 the core non-profit sector accounted for 2.5 percent of the Canada's gross domestic product (GDP)—outpacing many key industries, and on average, surpassing total economic activity in Canada (Haggar-Guénette et al., 2009). Further, the top contributors to the GDP in the core non-profit sector were typically smaller, heterogeneous agencies in the social services, development, and housing sectors (Haggar-Guénette et al., 2009).

In terms of social service delivery, recent research suggests that governments are increasingly relying on the third sector to deliver public services on their behalf (Brown & Trout, 2007; Scott, 2003; Statistics Canada, 2005). The *National Survey of Nonprofits and Volunteer Organizations* reveals that seventy-five percent of this sector is engaged in some sort of human service delivery in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2005).

A study by Frankel (2006) on the non-profit and voluntary sector in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Territories found that, as of 2003, the Prairie region was home to 17, 034 non-profit and voluntary organizations—the highest number of organizations per 100, 000 population. The two thirds of such organizations in the region primarily serve locally in their neighbourhood or locale, with social service provision being an area of "moderate" focus and activity (Frankel, 2006, p. vi). As of 2003, regional organizations reported more than 12 billion in revenue, and employ approximately 13 percent of the region's labour force.

The Structure of Government Funding

In Canada, third sector organizations rely on various funding sources and mechanisms for social service delivery—private donations from individuals and/or corporations, United Ways/Centraides fundraising campaigns, investments, and various government resources (Scott, 2003). A national survey of the non-profit and voluntary sector in Canada reveals that the sector receives almost half (49 percent) of its funding from government sources (Statistics Canada, 2005). Although the focus of this study is on direct forms of government funding, it is important to note that the government uses both direct and indirect forms of financial assistance to third sector agencies through tax assistance (ie. the GST rebate and charity tax credit), as well as through in-kind donations—such as contributions of meeting space, equipment and facilities, training opportunities, and personnel exchanges (Scott, 2003).

Direct federal and provincial funding is generally distributed through three main mechanisms—grants, contributions, and contracts. Grants are the most flexible transfers in that they require the least amount of detailed explanation for the use of funds. However, grants still have eligibility criteria and some reporting requirements (Imagine Canada, 2017). The purpose of grant programs are to provide organizational support and capacity building. Although some government departments directly operate grant programs, they often set up independent granting bodies such as the *Canada Council of the Arts* or the *Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council* (Scott, 2003).

Contributions are conditional transfer payments that are dispersed according to a defined purpose and expenses are categorized in conjunction with more specified and frequent performance requirements (Imagine Canada, 2017). As Scott (2003) notes, “Requests for Proposals (RFPs) often establish detailed eligibility criteria, often setting out preferences for non-profit, voluntary sector providers” (p. 15). Most service purchase agreements are set out in the form of contributions as they fund certain services over a number of years; however, most short-term project funding also takes this form (Scott, 2003). Contributions are increasingly becoming the most frequent delivery mechanism of government funding for third sector agencies (Scott, 2003). Contribution agreements are not always competitively tendered as it is not uncommon for governments to extend contribution agreements in certain service areas where there is a positive, long-term relationship with an agency. However, it is important to note that these renewed agreements are still subjected to considerable oversight and extensive reporting requirements (Scott, 2003).

Contracts are payments made in order for a third sector organization to deliver specific programs or services on behalf of governments (Imagine Canada, 2017). Scott (2003) explains that, “the term “contract” is reserved for contracting for goods and services where there is competition between potential contractors – both non-profit and for-profit organizations – designed to promote value for money” (p. 15). This form of funding is designed to cultivate greater efficiency and market effectiveness of the delivery of particular services.

Federal/Provincial/Municipal Jurisdictions

Significantly, the various levels of government in Canada—federal, provincial, and municipal—have specific areas of jurisdiction and responsibility that often dictate where a third sector organization will go to seek funding. Legislatively, the courts have generally interpreted national responsibilities over areas of commerce and trade, and liberally interpreted provincial jurisdiction over property, civil issues, and municipal matters (Beaudoin & Panneton, 2015). Beaudoin & Panneton (2015) reveal that four areas of social concern are shared by the provinces and the federal governments: agriculture, immigration, old-age pensions and supplementary benefits. With federal powers being concentrated in areas of agriculture and immigration, and education and old age pensions condensed under provincial jurisdiction. Municipalities are granted authority by federal and provincial governments to generally oversee local (both urban and rural) concerns and immediate services such as water and waste removal services, law enforcement, city parks and recreation, roads and public transportation, and public health services (Plunkett, 2006).

Federal grants are administered through various departments under federal jurisdiction, and provincial governments generally receive grants and funds through federal transfers. Provinces are then responsible for administering monies through their various departments and local sources (Smith, L., 2017). Municipal governments generally acquire grants from federal and provincial sources, and can also contract non-profit community groups to deliver services on their behalf (Smith, L., 2017).

Departments and ministries can be organized quite differently across provinces and municipalities according to the policies, priorities, and practices of each governing political party. Often several ministries will have jurisdiction across various social service areas. For non-profit organizations, this means that one program within an agency can be funded through several different provincial departments with various funding mechanisms (ie. fee-for-service contracts, core operating grants, short-term project funds). For instance, in Manitoba, the Healthy Child Strategy works across various governmental departments such as Manitoba Education and Training, Manitoba Families, and Manitoba Justice to fund and support community-based initiatives for children, youth, and their families (Government of Manitoba, 2017). Similarly, Saskatchewan's FASD Prevention Framework operates across ministries such as the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Services, and the Ministry of Education to fund and support women’s health, as well as individuals living with Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) (Government of Saskatchewan, 2014).

A fuller discussion of the how funds are transferred from federal coffers to provincial and municipal jurisdiction is not possible here; however, it is important to note that federal-provincial transfers have substantive implications for service provision as they often inform the amount of funds available to each jurisdiction for service provision and which service areas are prioritized (Habibov & Fan, 2008; Rice, 2005). For instance, Rice (2005) argues that structural changes to the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST) in 2004 (now the Canada Health Transfer and the Canada Social Transfer) have meant that provincial governments are now in a position to alter their commitments in key areas of social services, welfare, health, and post-secondary education without federal government review.

Service Provision in the Prairie Region

A regional study by Frankel (2006) found that non-profits and voluntary organizations in the Prairie Provinces and Territories receive more than half of their funding (53 percent) from the government. Among the provinces and territories in the region, there is significant variation with Saskatchewan’s organizations receiving 56 percent of their funding from government; whereas Manitoba’s organizations received 54 percent, and organizations in the Territories receive 35 percent. Social service activities within the sector generally receive less federal and municipal funding, and more provincial funding, in this region as compared with other regions nation-wide.

Similar to other studies, Frankel (2006) cites reductions in government funds and the cumbersome structure of reporting requirements are linked to reduced organizational functioning and capacity-building within the Prairies and the Territories. Of those non-profit organizations who receive external funding, almost two-thirds reported challenges due to reductions in government funding, an over-reliance on short-term project funding, and government reluctance to fund core operations. Almost half of non-profit organizations identified the pressure to modify programs as a substantive issue in light of criteria and reporting requirements, with two in five agencies identifying reporting imperatives as problematic. In the social services field, more than half cited difficulties obtaining a particular type of paid staff, while half acknowledged obstacles providing staff training and development. Internal sustainability issues, such as policy development and an increased demand for services, were also highlighted for those agencies with less diversified funding sources.

As service provision is the primary mechanism of addressing and redressing issues of systemic oppression, social stratification, and other socio-political inequalities, it is crucial to examine how government—third sector funding partnerships are contributing or hindering service provision in Canada and in the Prairie region.

Social Impacts & Service Provision

Overall, studies have shown that there is a growing gap between the high-income and low-income earners in Canada (Beach, 2007; Cunningham, 2007). Additionally, statistics highlight how patterns of social stratification based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, and ability ensure that certain groups are privileged over others within the country. For instance, a Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD) study on urban poverty (2007a) found that the populations most susceptible to poverty were often concentrated in larger urban areas, and involved vulnerable groups such as Indigenous persons, persons with disabilities, immigrants, and other visible minorities.

Age, gender, and family arrangements are closely linked to social dimensions correlated with greater vulnerability to poverty (CCSD, 2007b). The study found that factors such as a gender gap in wages, increased caregiver responsibilities, systemic policies negatively impacting women, and higher concentrated of women in lower waged occupations all contribute to men enjoying more economic stability than women in Canada. Ability is also closely linked with economic and social stability. Persons with disabilities in Canada are one-and-a-half more times likely to experience poverty than people without disabilities—with children being the most vulnerable group in this population (CCSD, 2007a).

The colonial legacy in Canada is reflected in the systemic inequalities that Indigenous peoples currently experience in Canada. While it is important to not perpetuate earlier colonial frames in which the plight of Indigenous peoples is condensed into a singular experienced characterized as 'the Indian problem,' it is important to note the disadvantaged position Indigenous peoples within multiple social categories (Atleo, 2009). Indigenous persons are disproportionately more likely to experience poverty, underemployment, imprisonment, chronic disease, polluted water supplies, and unsafe and inadequate housing than the non-Indigenous population (Statistics Canada, 2001; 2006; RCAP, 1996). Among Indigenous populations, Aboriginal women, children, and individuals with disabilities are more likely to experience the most disadvantaged position. For instance, Indigenous women are more likely to experience poverty, chronic health conditions, and higher levels of violence than Indigenous men (Bourassa, McKay-McNabb, and Hampton, n.d; Statistics Canada, 2006). While poverty impacts 13 percent of Canadian children overall, this number rises to 60 percent when accounting for First Nations children living on reserves. Indigenous children living off reserve, along with other disadvantaged groups, experience a 22-32 percent poverty rate (Macdonald & Wilson, 2016).

Racialized impacts are also evidenced by the statistics on the lived reality of immigrants and visible minorities. For instance, recent immigrants were three times more likely to experience poverty than those who immigrated prior to 1986 (CCSD, 2007a). Visible minorities were also more likely than Caucasian, non-Indigenous counterparts to live in poverty (CCSD, 2007a).

In the Prairie region, these multiple deprivations are explicitly experienced by disadvantaged groups. According to several Statistics Canada (2003; 2010a; 2010b; 2010c) reports on the non-reserve Indigenous population, the highest concentrations of Aboriginal populations are living in Northern Territories and Prairie Provinces. For non-reserve Indigenous populations living within urban prairie spaces, many experience crowded and insecure housing conditions, higher unemployment rates, lower income, and more frequent reports of chronic health conditions than the non-Indigenous population (Statistics Canada, 2010a; 2010b; 2010c). Racialized impacts in terms of immigrant groups are also evident in the Prairies as such groups experience higher rates of poverty than the national average (CCSD, 2007a). Such statistics may also help to explain why the Manitoba, Saskatchewan and the Territories region ties with British Colombia for having the highest percentage of organizations service Indigenous peoples, and the highest percentage of agencies serving the elderly of any region (Frankel, 2006).

Briefly highlighting the multiple social inequalities many people and groups experience in Canada is important in several ways. First, many scholars argue that social inequality feeds injustices leading to poverty, oppression, and economic insecurity (Mulvale, 2011). Second, social inequality contributes to a decrease in democratic engagement and social cohesion, which in turn can led to social conflict and de-stabilization (Beach, 2007; Cunningham, 2007). Cunningham (2007) explains that while markets may be good at *cultivating* wealth, they are not effective at *distributing* wealth; therefore democratic inclusion and political engagement is necessary to mitigate distributive challenges that led to conflict and exclusion in market-based economies. Such concerns dovetail with the peacebuilding endeavour, which posits that it is "…the space of recognition that ultimately the quality of our life is dependent on the quality of life of others" (Lederach 2005, p. 35). Stepping into this space of recognition and serving the public is the third sector.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the third sector was shown to operate in the space between the formal and informal spheres of Western democracies. Though various frameworks define and describe the non-profits in different ways, it is clear that governments are increasingly relying on such organizations to deliver social services—with the Prairie Provinces having the highest number of third sector organizations per 100,000 population in Canada (Frankel, 2006). This overview has emphasized the civil society view of non-profits is particularly grounded in emancipatory values of democratic civic engagement, community development, and citizen empowerment. The chapter also shared various perspectives of third sector—government funding dynamics, with particular focus on the structure of non-profit funding and jurisdictional areas of responsibility within the Canadian context. The economic and social impacts of funding mechanisms in the Prairie Provinces and Territories are also explored and how these impacts are experienced in racialized and gendered ways.

Chapter 5: Methodology and Methods

Introduction

Through the narrative inquiry method, this study invites the perspectives and experiences of third sector service providers as to whether they think there are resource disparities between government funds and agency needs, and why they think such gaps exist. Through their stories and experiences, participants also reveal how they navigate service gaps, and how they think the sector can be a conduit of social change within the current funding paradigm. Narrative inquiry is an important methodological approach for this study as it is a method of qualitative research that seeks to understand "people's lives and how they are lived out and composed" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. xxii). Narrative inquiry is predicated on the notion that through one person sharing their perspective and experience, another person can attempt to stand in another's shoes and experience the world as they do (Riley & Hawe, 2005). Throughout this study, I have attempted to stand in the shoes of eight individuals and contemplate the various elements that have shaped their perceptions and experiences. This section situates my experience by outlining the methodological structure of narrative inquiry, and the methods I employed to invite, document, gather, and analyze the experiences that were shared.

Methodology: Narrative Inquiry

Narratives, often referred to as stories or discourses, can be conveyed in both written and oral form across various settings, and may be the vehicle of fictional tales or transmit deep personal experiences and social histories (Pia, 2013; Senehi, 2009). As an analytical tool, narrative inquiry appreciates that experiences occur on various layers, such as time and location, as well as within internal and interpersonal relationships (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). By examining these various layers of human experience, the narrative inquirer seeks “to understand how people think through events and what they value” (Riley & Hawe, 2005, p. 229). Such experiences are examined for why and how the story is told, and uncovered for what themes consistently arise. Moreover, narrative inquiry utilizes complexity thinking as narrative “is the lens through which seemingly independent and disconnected elements are seen as related to the whole” (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001, p. 998). In this way, narrative inquiry appreciates the complexity of the human experience, and as with complexity theory, seeks to examine how personal and collective stories are related to broader socio-cultural values, norms, and events across time and circumstance (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riley & Hawe, 2005

It also means that in the narrative method, the researcher-participant relationship is of foremost importance, as “What is told, as well as the meaning of what is told, is shaped by the relationship” (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p. 94-5). In order to privilege this relationship it is also important to be mindful about how research texts are gathered, interpreted, and re-told (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Due to my previous connections with the non-profit social service sector, I wanted to research an area that I was still had some connection to, but was still yet somewhat of an ‘outsider.’ As I have only ever been a staff member within an agency—never an agency director—I felt that the research field would be ‘external’ enough that I could interact with research critically, but would also re-connect me with the world of community service that has provided such value and meaning in my life.

Data Collection

Between May 2016 and June 2016, sixteen semi-structured interviews with eight Executive and/or Program Directors of non-profit social service agencies were conducted in a Prairie urban centre. Each agency reflects diverse social service areas including justice, employment services, family support, community-based services for women and children, disability services, and community economic development. Participants were selected based on my prior personal and/or professional knowledge of them or of their agency. An email invitation providing information about the aims and content of the research, and the research process, was provided to potential participants prior to the study. Despite my initial apprehension and nervousness that I would not have sufficient interest, I was incredibly honoured by the keen responses I received. One participant noted in an email the timeliness of my proposed research about government funding during a year in which a federal election had just occurred, and a provincial election was soon to take place. Of course, I assured him that, as much as I might like to take credit for this for this fortuitous timing, it really came down to when the research period fit within my academic and personal schedule. Nonetheless, these larger political events did set some of the context, as well as shaped some of the discussion with participants. This dynamic will be discussed in later detail in the study results.

The Participants

Email invitations were sent to individuals cognizant of factors such as gender and ethnicity. Of the eight interviewees, there are three males and five females. As the social service field is distinguished by its predominately female composition, I was pleased to note that this dynamic at the staff levels also applied to women leadership within the field. This may be impacted by the fact that I am a female and have more female contacts within my networks, or perhaps female participants were more comfortable meeting with me as opposed to a male researcher. Whatever the reason, this composition did permit me to provide a gender analysis, and although most female participants did not directly discuss their experiences of leadership in terms of gender, issues such as the gendered nature of social service work did arise in many interviews.

I had hoped to have greater cross-cultural diversity in the study—particularly those community organizations that identify as Indigenous-led. However, due to a lack of response, these voices are unfortunately not represented in my study. Upon reflection, I wondered if this was due to my own location as a white women with very little personal connection in visible minority and Indigenous communities. My thesis advisor also gently reminded me that due to the political and social climate nationally, provincially, and locally, it was highly likely that these agencies were extremely busy advocating and serving their clients and communities. My hope is that a greater awareness of the racialized elements of social service provision that continue to hinder peacebuilding efforts could still be highlighted through those who were interviewed as several participants identified ways in which their personal and professional ongoing commitment to healing and reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities informs their work.

As directors of third sector organizations, all individuals have over a decade (or more) of experience in community service work. Although one participant noted earlier experience within the private sector, a majority of the participants' professional experiences are characterized by their long-time work within the non-profit human services. Some had previous occupations with the civil service, while others had only ever worked in community-based grassroots organizations or with non-profit community foundations.

The Third Sector Agencies

Despite the lack of agencies identifying as Indigenous-led, organizations from a cross-section of social services are represented. As noted earlier, each agency engages in diverse service areas, and oftentimes in multiple social areas. For instance, one agency provides individual counselling, day care support services, and operates several community family resource centres throughout the city. Another organization facilitates neighbourhood safety audits, and provides job skills training for newcomer youth in addition to other programs for community residents. Another agency emphasizes increasing financial literacy for low-income families and other stakeholder groups, while also facilitating various Indigenous-led community collaborations.

The agencies involved with this study are considered “formal” non-profit agencies as they are all registered with the Canada Revenue Agency and have an “institutional presence” with established governance structures that employ at least one paid staff (Scott, 2003, p. 64). Despite this similarity, most of the agencies are characterized by how varied their operations and activities are. In terms of annual revenues, agencies run the gamut from just over one million in reported revenue up to eleven million. In 2016, financial reports indicate that all the agencies interviewed receive over sixty percent of their funding from government departments. However, the amount of government funding each agency receives is somewhat diverse. Two agencies receive over ninety percent of their funds from the government; three agencies over sixty percent; and three account just over eighty percent of their revenue from government sources. Provincial departments are the largest government funder for all eight agencies, followed by federal sources. Of this group, only one agency reported funding from municipal coffers.

Consistent with research highlighted in Chapter 4, most agencies received provincial funding through various departmental sources and mechanisms. A majority of the organizations received a combination of long-term grants—often carried over multiple years for core operations—and shorter term funds (6 month to one year) for specific projects or pilot projects. Two agencies are administered government monies primarily through a fee-for-service funding model, and a third organization receives fee-for-service funding for a majority of its programming in addition to a multi-year operating grant for an affiliated program.

The organizations are also distinguished by their staffing levels: one agency employs approximately 300 staff; two other organizations employ both part-time and full-time workers in the 140 to 70 range, while the other agencies retain employees at various levels—from 40 to 20 full or part-time positions. Much of this variability is due to the fact that agencies have diverse programming structures and needs that operate in diverse task environments and require distinctive roles, skills, and abilities. For instance, some agencies offer in-home support services for individuals with intellectual and cognitive disabilities, and such job roles require more intensive, around-the-clock care. Outreach services within the community setting are offered by another agency to clients living with a neurodevelopmental disability. Other agencies, and other job roles within agencies, provide client services primarily through direct services at the agency office. Two organizations with a community development focus have satellite programs operating in other community locations requiring staff, in addition to employees working at the primary agency site.

There was also significant diversity in terms of length of operation in the community. For example, one agency had been in operation for over eighty years; three had been in operation between thirty and fifty years; while the remainder of the agencies have been involved in their communities for just over twenty years. Although agencies were located across several community districts, all agencies were similarly situated within lower socio-economic areas of the city.

Description of Methods

The ‘busyness’ factor among participants was expected and anticipated. I knew that executive directors are generally a very busy group of people who may have limited time to arrange meetings. For this reason, I was grateful and humbled by the eight responses I did receive. I also was aware that my research topic could be a particularly sensitive topic for agencies—and could have potentially detrimental impacts for those reliant on government funds—if they were perceived to be critical or negative of funders and/or other agencies. From the beginning, I knew that ensuring the confidentiality would be of primary importance to the research participants and me.

In order to maintain this confidentiality all names are changed through the use of pseudonyms, and identifying information, such as names, departments, addresses, and place of employment from all quotations are removed. Furthermore, the location of my study is only generally identified as a Prairie city. Free and informed written consent was obtained from each participant prior to the research. On-going consent was obtained both verbally throughout the research process, as well as via email when both interviews were scheduled and agreed upon. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw or discontinue participation in the study at any time. Despite busy schedules, all eight participants met with me twice during the study period.

Through two semi-structured interviews with each participant, I was able to gather information about how leaders within their organizations understand and navigate the impacts of current government funding models on social service provision, and how they think government funding policies and practices can better support non-profit service provision in the future. I had significant conversations with these individuals about how they interpret and understand their non-profit work, and how the sector as a whole can foster communities of greater inclusion, respect, and empowerment for clients, staff, and communities—particularly within the political climate in which this study was conducted (see Appendices for Interview Guides)

Each interview lasted approximately one and half hours, and in consideration of convenience and confidentiality, all interviews were conducted at participants' agency offices. Both interviews used a semi-structured format using open-ended questions and incorporating prompts as necessary. From the first interview, participants were encouraged to openly discuss their perspectives on funding shortfalls, the impacts on service provision, and creative strategies they employed to navigate these impacts. As questions were open-ended, conversations generally flowed quite organically—often without the guide or prompts needed. At times, I would clarify a response, or pick up an earlier conversational thread, but from my perspective, this intervention was minimal (see Appendix A for first Interview Guide).

The second interview often followed up on key themes that appeared in the first interviews in order to gain richer, more contextualized feedback (Hesse-Biber & Leavey, 2006). However, I also noted that as I interviewed more participants, I found myself naming some key themes that were emerging and inviting the participants on their second interviews to provide their insights on key themes arising from first interviews. In this way second interviews became more of integrative process whereby I was identifying common themes emerging, along with a few areas of diversity. When there was points of difference, I would make a point to follow up with the participant to clarify and/or gain more insight into this experience or perspective (see Appendix B for second Interview Guide). Identification and analysis of points of divergence is important in complexity-inspired narrative inquiry as it reveals how similar events can be interpreted in varied ways depending on the meaning that is attached to the event, and the context in which the event occurs (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001). Moreover, this meaning can change as memory and expectations can shift and alter over time (Senehi, 2011; Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001)

All participants' experiences and perspectives were digitally recorded with participant's permission. As these recordings were transcribed verbatim, this provided me with an opportunity to engage with the participant's conversations from various angles and to reveal information that was otherwise missed from the research process (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). Further, the pauses and tentative word phrases within the transcripts were an important part of the analytic process as they revealed some gaps in my interview approach (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). As I shared copies of the transcripts with participants, it also allowed to me to gain participants' feedback on the quotes and re-structure quotes in order to better align with their communicative intent.

Field notes were also taken pre and post interviews. Consistent with methods used in narrative inquiry, I kept notes that described and interpreted both my internal thoughts and feelings as a researcher in preparation for an interview, in addition to recording key phrases and questions during conversations and interviews (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Documents relevant to the agency such as annual reports, program newsletters, financial reports, and website information were also examined in addition field notes in order to provide me with a greater context for the agency's daily operations and how this intersects with the administration of government funds. Government documents pertaining to funding and policy development were also reviewed as an integral part of my contextual analysis and understanding how cultural and political systems impact economic policies geared towards third sector agencies.

Data Analysis

Although narratives are documented and analyzed by the researcher, becoming a narrative inquirer ultimately means locating oneself within the encounter between researcher and participant. Positioned within the qualitative research method, narrative inquiry is premised on the notion that human knowledge is not 'pure', or external to the knower, but is connected to the researchers own internal perspectives, desires, and motivations (McNiff & Whitehead, 2011). This means that the narrative researcher should critically reflect on the ways they are contributing the research and shaping the research process (Tsoukas & Hatch, 2001).

In addition to larger contextual analysis, as a narrative inquirer it was also important to engage with meanings at the micro-level by examining the participants' personal accounts. For instance, I identified whether sentences were descriptive, logical, evaluative, or transformative in nature (Riley & Hawe, 2005). This meant examining and interpreting whether the respondents often described events, or attached causal or evaluative implications to their views, or highlighted personal changes in perceptions and views. Further, in examining the 'narrative' of a person's story, is to investigate why and how the story is being told—from this investigation the overall organizing theme, or narrative, can be identified (Riley & Hawe, 2005).

As participants frequently shared how they understand their experiences in the context of being social change agents, I integrated elements of the rhetoric of social intervention (RSI) model into my narrative analysis. The RSI model looks at how participants name and categorize physical and conceptual experiences, and then share these experiences in the context of social change (Opt & Gring, 2009). As such, I felt it was important to incorporate into my analysis the ways in which social interventions addressing issues of needs and power are named and brought to attention (Opt & Gring, 2009).

Further to this analysis, field notes, transcripts, external agency documents, and government policy documents were not interpreted as ‘stand-alone’, isolated records but were each examined for how they interconnected with one another. For instance, transcripts were compared and contrasted with how they differed from my personal field notes; government policy documents were contrasted with transcript accounts of government policy. Analysis also focused on the initial funding circumstances of an agency, the relationship dynamic between funder-recipient, and any mention of sector-wide persistent patterns (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Haggis, 2009). Comparing and contrasting information from a variety of sources is important for maintaining credibility in qualitative research as it accounts “for the complexities that present themselves in a study”, and attempts to deal with “patterns that are not easily explained” (Guba; as cited in Mills, 2007, p. 85). Employing multiple readings also has the ability to go beyond verbal accounts and permits a deeper analysis of the attitudes and assumptions guiding personal and social behaviours (Mills, 2007).

All written documentation and audio recordings were stored in a locked filing cabinet in my home, and digital files were stored on a password-protected computer. All audio recordings were deleted upon submission of final interim report in November 2016. Digital files and written documentation will be deleted/shredded upon study completion in August 2017.

The Use of Interim Reports

Establishing collaboration with participants was an important part of this research process. This meant that not only would I be engaged in critical reflection throughout the research, but that I would invite others to also engage in critical analysis in order to verify my interpretations of events and interviews. Herr and Anderson (2015) describe how qualitative researchers within a participatory framework must ensure that the researcher is inclusive of the voices that are involved in the research and responsive to these voices as a matter of ethical validity.

In order to facilitate ongoing communication with participants and establish a collaborative process, I used interim reports to communicate with each participant after completion of the first interview and second interviews. Interim reports are interpretative accounts of events, conversations, and/or interviews situated between field texts and the final research account (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). All participants consented to, and were provided, these interim reports. Transcripts were also offered and made available to all participants. Participants were also encouraged to send me any feedback regarding deletions, additions and/or clarifications of direct quotes or other information contained in the reports, and these changes were made so that my interpretative reports aligned with their intentions and concerns. This interactive process continued into the draft phase of my thesis as I submitted my interpretation of results with participants via email prior to the final submission of my thesis. Although this process did not result in substantive changes to the final study analysis, participant acknowledgement and engagement was integral to ensuring my research process was inclusive and responsive.

In addition to gather feedback on the interpretative accuracy of their interview accounts, the use of interim reports also allowed me to analyze and interpret data throughout the research process. As I frequently condensed many pages of transcription into two or three pages, interim reports facilitated the process of examining the data, coding particular themes, and then comparing and contrasting coded segments in order to articulate similarities and differences between interviews and participants (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). This analytical coding process was represented in each report, and participants were apprised of the common themes as they were arising from the research. By the second interim reports, data had become distilled into several cross-cutting themes across both interviews.

Conclusion

Through the method of narrative inquiry, the researcher, the research participant, and the research process are never understood in isolation. Personal experiences are examined and connected to broader socio-cultural, political, and economic interactions and relationships. Through interviews I was able to gather, analyze and interpret how these agency directors negotiate government funding mechanisms. In order identify overall themes and provide a contextualized analysis, I examined personal interview accounts, as well as program and policy documents at organizational and governmental levels. Interviews were transcribed and interim reports were created; both documents were voluntarily shared with participants in order to foster transparency and collaboration, and to establish with participants the interpretative accuracy of my final results.

Chapter 6: Discussion of Results

Part 1—Funding Challenges and Navigation Techniques

Introduction

Two interconnected, but distinct, themes arose from my research questions. To address this dynamic I have divided the discussion of results into two chapters: Chapter 6 reveals *Funding Challenges and Navigation Techniques*; Chapter 7 discusses *Policies and Strategies for Change*. Through the use of pseudonyms, this chapter concentrates on revealing participants' perspectives on resource disparities within their agency. First, whether they identified gaps between government funds and agency needs; second, why they thought those gaps existed; and third, the ways in which they were able to navigate these gaps and constraints. A majority of participants framed funding resource disparities in terms of contract inflexibility, and inadequate employee compensation and training, and provided specific insights into how these issues impacted service provision within their agency. The strengths and limitations of several navigation techniques such as diversification, the formation of umbrella partnerships, resourcefulness, and employee education and training are also shared.

Funding Challenges

Contract Constraints

The organizations of the parties interviewed had all been in existence for well over ten years, and generally have funding sources that are well-established. Several had been awarded operating grants in an earlier economic climate characterized by less fiscal restraint. This may be a contributing factor to why participants did not generally identify operating deficits. However, this does not mean that challenges were not identified. Although several study participants confirmed the existence of funding shortfalls and resource gaps in the third sector, they often distinguished between non-monetary and monetary resource gaps. Participants such as Jason acknowledged that resource disparities within the sector was a product of a confluence of various socio-economic factors. As he explains,

> …funding has been tight for years, and it's not just the fault of the government, interest rates are low. A lot of foundations [and charitable organizations] that groups like ours would rely onto have a certain amount of money coming in, when the rates are so low, the income on the foundations is very tight and so they have less money to distribute…

Jason emphasizes that these macro-level factors do impact the level and amount of programming and services agencies are able to provide. As he notes,

> …So, if the available funding were to increase we would be able to add additional programs and services. And there certainly are additional programs and services we see a need for, that our clients have a need for, that we have the capacity to offer, and an interest in offering, that we're not offering because the resources aren't there.

A key point made by participants is that core, stable funding is vital to providing services to community in holistic, sustainable ways. This is consistent with other research in Canada that reveals stable, renewed multi-year funding contributes to long-term viability and sustainability of community agencies (Eakin, 2007). MacKinnon and colleagues (2012) acknowledge that although sustainability has become a "buzzword" over the years, it signifies the importance of agencies having the ability to carry out their commitments to the clients and the community (p. 7). Core funding is typified by grants, which allows recipients more flexibility and autonomy as it used by an organization to cover operational and/or programming costs (Scott, 2003). Despite this, researchers identify increasing reluctance on the part of Canadian governments to provide sustained funds to third sector agencies (Eakin, 2007; MacKinnon et al, 2012; Scott, 2003).

Participants such as Fiona acknowledge interconnected factors of agency size and institutional age when comparing her agency with two newer organizations serving a similar clientele,

> The other two agencies are newer in their development, and you know, in their age, so they didn't get that kind of funding in their beginning years. So they have to rely on other funders contributing enough to be able to pay for the central. We still need lots of that. Because we would be larger than them, you need more [core funding] 'cause when you're larger you need to grow too.

Dana also credits core funding partners, independent from government, with supporting her agency as they continue to innovate new ways of responding and working with the community. As she states,

> Having core funding, and this is one of the things that I thank United Way for all the time, gives us the ability to pilot. It gives us the ability to try new things. It has allowed us to step out of what the traditional funding is doing. It gives us the ability to be very clear. It's not the grants that are available that shape what we do, it is what our focus is on as to what is needed. And then it allows us to then go fight for that to be funded.

The issue of core funding highlights that, for many third sector organizations, key importance is placed on the *mechanism* of funding—not simply the amount of financial resources offered. In fact, several directors asserted that their agencies did have sufficient government funds from their various provincial and federal contracts to meet service provision needs. For these directors, the issue of resource disparity was very real but had more to do with the funding mechanism—or how government funding contracts were *structured*. As Mark shares,

> On that topic, and I've been telling it to anybody who'll care to listen is, there's a big difference between, 'I just need more money to do what I do,' and 'I need my contract to be re-constructed so that I can do more with the money I've been given.' There's a big difference between the two. Because more money isn't the answer. But taking the constraints off the money we're given, I believe, is the answer.

These concerns resonate with other Canadian studies that reveal how funding mechanisms are not neutral—they have both the ability to impose constraints and create opportunities that impact whether an organizations can pursue and achieve their goals (Scott, 2003). Participants identified several ways that constraints are built into the fabric of funding mechanisms. For instance, Mark identified how there was a high degree of accountability without a lot of discretion in his funding contracts when he says,

> When you're working with a set of policies and guidelines that prescribe everything right down the infinite line item in your budget, the ability to be creative and innovative—with the flux that just happens in staffing and in the economies and whatnot—it's very difficult to navigate around those with such tight, tight constraints.

These constraints were identified at the initial contract-writing phase for the agency in order to determine eligibility, as well as when funding agreements were finalized and required accurate accounting and auditing. Speaking to this dynamic, Mark clarified that even when total expenditures are under budget, his quarterly reports to funders will require an alternate report to account for every deviation on every line on the budget. For respondents such as Fiona, the accountability structure through which an agency details outcomes to the funder was also characterized by high rigidity. Further, such agreements were noted as revealing competing tensions between those outcomes that focus on the *quality* of service provision with other outcomes that privilege that *quantity* of service provision. As Fiona comments,

> In the not-for-profit sector we still have to identity priorities, and trends, and strategic directions, and all of those pieces. But we don't necessarily have the ability to take our budget and use it in a different way based on those things all the time.

Further, she says:

> I mean this is the struggle I think with funders is it quality or quantity of service? Because you could have people who share their success by saying, "We had a thousand people walk through our door last year. And we've provided service to a thousand people." That's great. But there might be another place who had fifty people walk through their door but the work that they did was way more intense, and way more holistic, and just provided larger impact and outcomes…Because who assesses it? And based on what lens? And based on whose idea of what's needed?

Fiona's comments also reveal an awareness that the ideological lens that a funder is using to assess funding needs, and to determine which agency delivers specific services, is of key concern. It is at this intersection where one can see that economic decisions are framed and constructed by socio-cultural and political values.

Sam attributes the mismatch between funder's reporting requirements and their outcome evaluation to a self-reinforcing cyclical dynamic whereby even if agencies can strategically plan, they are often not provided the necessary resources to implement the plan. As he explains,

> It's beyond reporting, like we could write a really good succession plan but we don't have money to bring in anyone before a position ends…because there's no time to transition, because we don't have money for it right? And so it's like we [have to] do it by taking admin[istration] from somewhere else…

Sam's comment identifies another structural constraint of government funding mechanisms—the inadequate allotment for administrative costs. Despite the trend of reduced funding for administration in the non-profit sector, Sam notes that the amount of administration needed to develop, facilitate, and oversee programs and services has actually increased. As he reveals,

> …I daresay if we had five percent on every fund in admin[istration], we'd probably be okay. We'd have enough to do all the things we want to do and be able to provide raises to staff. Build a [an employee wage] scale, some of those things….and this is what I always want to say to funders, "Look at how much it takes you to administer the fund?" Like for the whole fund. So think about what other people are putting in that are having to deal with community every day, and crisis, and having to do all these extra things that you're not funding for. And so is ten percent that crazy to ask for right? It would be a huge thing that would build a lot of stability into the not-for-profit sector right away.

Lack of Employee Investment

Although administration is often linked with burdensome overhead in highly bureaucratic organizations, Sam re-frames this interpretation of administration by defining administration in terms of adequately compensating staff for their time and efforts. In this way Sam suggests that the government not only has a role to play in adequately compensating sector employees, but also has a responsibility to create supportive government policy and legislation of social initiatives. For Sam, these initiatives were often framed in terms of investments. For instance, he suggests,

> But I think like the government's role is to create policies that support positive investment into the places that are needed. Right? That's what governments for—they should be creating policy around whatever it is, raising the minimum wage …and then we can make that happen on the ground with the proper investment…

Mark also noted that the issue of sufficient employee wages was linked to fairness and a sense of justice. As Mark initially worked in the for-profit sector, he also compares the divergence in expectations in both sectors as he says,

> And I know that most people in the not-for-profit world, especially the social services world would say that we are not doing this for money, but the reality is, is everybody needs to be paid a fair wage, everybody needs to receive cost of living increases and benefits and pensions are just, in the for-profit world are just considered normal. In the not-for-profit world funded by government they're not. None of those things are considered normal.

This comment was echoed by several participants who identified the discrepancy in wage scales between non-profit and government employees as problematic. Although many third sector agencies are tasked with performing pseudo-government roles, it was noted that these employees are not provided the same wages and benefits as their government counterparts. Fiona offers a couple of suggestions to address wage disparities,

> It would be nice to have a conversation about what standard salaries are in the field. And you know I don't think anybody expects them to be in line with government salaries, but I guess you hear that a lot and my question would be, "Why not?" Why do we just keep saying, "Well it's not government?" Why can't you choose whether you work in government or not-for-profit and be paid equally?

A critical element Fiona also highlights is the interconnections between the gendered nature of non-profit service work and how funding mechanisms tend to reinforce the undervaluing of the 'caring' labour within the sector. As she illustrates,

> I did a salary review…and I looked back at someone who has been working here eighteen years, and they had not had a raise the entire time they'd been here. And I gave one the year before, so they had one the year before and this year. And if I look at what we're funded for that person, we're not even funded for what they're paid. That's horrible. For

> me, I’m speaking from a women-centred perspective, we’re talking about [our agency] trying to support women, and trying to promote and empower women to have full choice and the ability to be independent in their life the way that they want it, and then we’re not giving the women who work here a raise.

This pattern has significant implications for both female clients and staff as it mirrors and further entrenches larger social dynamics which undermine the caring components of work that is rooted in peacebuilding values of equity, capacity-building, and inclusion. This case example also reveals how gendered arrangements can interact and become encoded in economic and institutional forms of society.

For participants such as Jason, inadequate employee wages was not identified as an overarching concern. Jason acknowledged that this may be partly due to his employees being paid wages at the higher end of the sector in addition to receiving benefits and pensions. Jason also recognizes that many recent university graduates join his agency in the hopes of gaining valuable work experience, as well as other non-monetary benefits, before moving on to other higher-level positions. Jason identified how this dynamic can actually have some positive impacts in terms of network building when he explains,

> So if somebody works here, and goes to work for government or goes to work for another agency, they’re just bringing in a relationship, assuming that they left this agency on a good basis—and they usually do. So I’m not particularly worried. It is a real factor, but we know that we don’t pay as much and we also try to compensate. We have a little extra vacation time, we try to be aware of staff needs, and encourage flexibility, and try to encourage some extra training and professional development. And then when they’re ready to go we can certainly support that as an agency and certainly help somebody find their next step. And I think people know that too when they come here. That we will train them well, give them some good experience, and help them for that next step.

For many participants, greater investment in staff was not solely about wage increases but was also about increased investments in employee education and training. For instance, Natalie identifies a cyclical dynamic whereby employee education is connected with increased staff retention, which is then linked to improved service provision when she explains,

> …I think that if we were actually providing people with the education required for our work, and building that sense of qualification and so on, we would have people staying and investing in improvement and innovation. But we don't have that because people are moving—it's the revolving door right? Our capacity is constantly being worn down—we're constantly re-training, we're constantly orientating people to the lives of people that they're going to be working with and supporting. And it's a constant rotating scenario. So that's discouraging because the resources that you do have are not being spent in the best possible way.

Employee education and staff development was cited by participants as a crucial element in building organizational capacity, yet reluctance of funders to finance staff development was also cited as equally problematic. Dana reveals her strategy with funders who cite reluctance may not want to fund staff professional development,

> Well we do get funders who say, "You know we don't fund professional development." But it's like, "You're going to talk about the quality of staff in the non-profit sector?" If that happens, we look to other grants to fill that in. And so we'll bring in a second funder to cover the cost of that project if someone's not funding it. I don't have a lot who will say, "I don't do overhead at all." Like, then you're not supporting this project.

Reasons for Funding Constraints

Another question that I was curious about was why did these funding constraints exist? There is a gap in the literature on third sector practitioners' perspectives regarding the underlying government policies informing funding practices. Although third sector actors are not situated within the government, they are greatly impacted by government policy as it interconnects with and impacts the scope of work that non-profit agencies can conduct. Although several participants were careful to point out that they were not government employees, and had only a limited picture of the various stressors that might impact government funding decisions, they did offer several insights into why they thought funding disparities and constraints existed from a policy perspective. Jason pointed to the election cycle in Canadian politics by noting,

> So things can—government can change. And then definitions of problems can change and definitions of solutions can change…

As this study occurred shortly after a federal election and during a provincial election, Jason's comments had particular relevance as there was still uncertainty among participants as to how the new federal and provincial administrations were going to impact funding priorities. Jason also describes a shift in political tactics in the last decade in which politicians are in "constant campaign mode," and good governance is replaced by the demands of the electoral cycle. As there is no legislation constraining broken campaign promises or divisive tactics Jason suggests that, ultimately, these strategies do not benefit the public good. As he says,

> I suspect in many cases, it's the agenda driven not by the people but by the government anticipating what the people are going to respond to. And not necessarily, not with an eye to what benefits the people, but with an eye to what's going to be popular with the people.

Fiona surmises that an additional reason why government funders are reluctant to provide core, central funding may have to do with the limited pool of taxpayer dollars. She describes the dilemma that many governments face when distributing and/or re-distributing existing funds when she explains,

> There's only so much that's collected from taxes and then if you want to keep giving it to certain groups, how do you make a decision of sustaining existing, or providing new opportunities for funding? Like that's a hard formula. So, I think you need to either take from the existing [resources], or you need to raise more money. And if you can't get more money, or raise more money from a tax perspective than you need to stop adding new people, adding new agencies right?

April also identified how a funder's mindset and ideology can influence how funders structure a funding contribution or contract, and influence how they administer the funds. She notes the bureaucratic mind-set of certain provincial funders when she admits,

> …like sometimes we're asking a department to, you know, sort of think creatively and do something. And they're like, "No. It's very black and white." But black and white is easy right? Black and white is that you look at it and go, 'No, I'm reading this, and this is how I interpret it." And it would be a lot more work to see it in the shades of grey and to effect change on it. So you have some people who want to do their job, and you have other people who want to make a difference. And I think then that defines how well a relationship goes in looking at a problem and finding a solution.

Funding Navigation Strategies

Diversification

Agency directors identified several ways they navigate funding constraints. Dana describes the importance of having a diversity of funding from several sources in order to diffuse an agency's financial risk. As Dana comments,

> So every grant [application] that you write should be putting you in a better position because the overhead you've got is now is shared by a larger group of projects…

Dana's suggestion correlates with research from Scott (2003) which noted a higher propensity of non-profits to diversify funding sources and mechanisms in order to reduce dependency and vulnerability to income uncertainties and the undue influence of resource providers.

Sam similarly linked diverse funding streams with the ability to be flexible and creative in serving clients in a more holistic and capacity-building way. Conversely, he described how those very advantages can also pose challenges administratively,

> So instead of just being a youth serving agency, or just a housing agency, we have all that in one, so it's always a challenge for us administratively. Because we can't go to the same funding pots all the time it kinda often limits where we can access funds because we do so much right?

Some participants were cautious of those agencies who 'bolted on' disparate services to bolster funding resources. For instance, Mark described how some not-for-profit agencies have increased and/or diversified their funding resources by having contracts attached to disparate programs that may stray from agency mission. He asserts that this can then tend to duplicate service efforts across the sector. For instance in his field of service Mark notes,

> But you know the way that contracts are built, there are some twenty six, thirty agencies in this province that have [the same kinds of] programs bolted onto their contract. And, and you sit back and go, 'Why?' It doesn't make sense if you look at it from a practical perspective, or even an execution perspective.

Umbrella Formations

Several directors remarked that it was important to consider an agencies' scale and scope of work when making economic decisions. One strategy that was frequently suggested to smaller agencies who wish to provide services in more cost-effective ways was to partner or merge with other like-minded agencies. Research by Bovaird (2014) highlights how dealing with economies of scale and scope is an important issue for third sector agencies. Due to increasing cost pressures on public services, many smaller agencies can seek to collaborate with other agencies in order to efficient and effective service through lower administration costs, more coordinated fundraising campaigns, and other streamlining of processes. However, he identifies that policy makers often focus solely on the enlarging the scale of service providers to the detriment of a focus on scope of learning which has the potential to bring together a rich diversity of approaches. In this study, April points to how smaller non-profits can reduce overhead costs more effectively by merging or partnering with several like-minded agencies. As she explains,

> And so one of the things that could be more efficient is when you have non-profits that merge and can build on a common theme, and help people across issues as well. So when I see a non-profit that has one approach, and they're small, I look and go, 'That overhead costs a lot. If you have five people and you're paying for a book-keeper for five people, and the building for five people? Well the overhead is really high.' But in an organization that is larger, they're sharing those costs across a number of programs.

Similarly, Sam discusses possibilities for smaller like-minded agencies to work together and to merge administrative and management functions,

> I don't want to create bureaucracies but it would be great to see one big kind of management structure with like ten agencies under it. Like that with a strong management team could work really well. And the overhead for small agencies with three or four people wouldn't have to be so high... So I think if there could be some management structures that can kind of provide that support without taking away autonomy and still have independence, and still having a board, and those kind of things. I know we would love to be a part of something like that.

The participants echoed Bovaird's (2014) caution that agency collaboration should not be focused on economies of scale to the exclusion of economies and scope and learning. For instance, Tanya recognized that her agencies fee-for-service funding model can pose a challenge for smaller organizations as she says:

> So it's kind of an economies of scale piece right? So if we even had thirty outreach clients as opposed to fifteen that would just give us so much more flexibility to very easily shuffle [an outreach staff person] to another participant.

In this way, the fee-for-service funding model can provide one-to-one individualized planning when there are greater numbers of clients, but makes it challenging to retain staff levels when there are fewer clients. However, Tanya also was careful to point out that smaller agencies can also provide continuity in mission and values which can also assist with retaining quality staff,

> 'Cause I think as soon as you have, for example, multiple people who are interviewing staff, or you have a separate HR department, and you know, as soon as the tasks become compartmentalized, it's just harder to flow that conversation.

April also clarified that efficient service delivery may not always be equated with cost-effectiveness when she notes, "…efficient in terms of the budget doesn't mean efficient operationally." This underscores a contradiction whereby funders often reward service agencies who operate with low-cost, seemingly 'efficient' overhead. With such a cyclical funding dynamic, an agency who has lower operational costs is further encouraged to maintain these lower costs, thereby entrenching the funder's expectation of lower operational costs. However, these lower overhead costs do not always permit an agency to implement more costly administrative processes up-front, which allow for more efficient outcomes later on. For example, April noted that when her agency needed to integrate technology into the agency's daily operations, although it was at a higher cost initially, it would lead to more efficient and effective agency functioning within contemporary technology-based society.

Resourcefulness

Many participants admitted that although resource disparities and contractual constraints do exist within the sector, non-profits are adept at navigating these funding constraints. For participants such as Sam, successfully navigating economic constraints is rooted in an ethics of social justice which is resistant to the commodification of social services. This means that service provision is understood as more than providing a 'service' to fill a hole—it is about being responsive to the community and those areas that the community identifies as important using both financial and non-financial resources. As he explains,

> We'd do it with no money right? We have no money, we'd get volunteers. It probably couldn't be as good as quality of a program as we have now, but we'd still be doing it. And I think that's a thing our neighbourhood has always said is, 'You know it's great if we can get funding to match it but we shouldn't let funding hold us back from doing what the community wants done.' So, if it means getting more residents involved, if it means pulling more volunteers in, you know, begging for supplies, whatever it is, I think we're willing to do whatever.

Sam's assertion is echoed by researchers such as Cottam (2008), who argue that the economic structure of Western society tends to see citizens as individual consumers defined by wants, and the political structure of the state sees us as defined by our needs. In contrast, a civil society peacebuilding model understands that individuals are not "atomized consumers" but rather desire to be socially connected to collectively make social change possible (Cottam, 2008, p. 5).

This narrative of 'resourcefulness,' which privileges both monetary and non-monetary kinds of resources, can be seen as contrasting earlier participant narratives on adequate employee compensation. However, both narratives highlight how charitable, value-based organizations have a long history of navigating socio-economic systems and providing services to people and groups despite shifts in political will and priorities. As discussed in earlier chapters, political will (or lack thereof) is often evidenced through funding priorities and decisions. As these decisions primarily follow the election cycle, many third sector agencies strive to meet the needs and goals of their clients and communities by recognizing this cyclical dynamic, yet not having their organizational values and mission dependent on it.

For other participants the narrative of resourcefulness reveals the willingness of agencies to 'do more with what they are given.' Adequately compensating employees for their work was one way participants expressed being *more* resourceful—by attracting and retaining competent and creative staff. As Mark says,

> …because these contracts are so tightly prescribed you haven't got the ability to extract out innovation and excellence in your organization to drive down your costs. Not so that you reduce your funding, but so that you free up funds to put a thing like pensions and benefits in place for employees, to keep better employees, to do a better job for you, to drive the costs down even more…

Transparent, Evidence-based Practices

Despite the structural constraints within funding mechanisms and time-intensive reporting requirements that were identified, participants overwhelmingly agreed that transparent reporting and accountability mechanisms are necessary to maintain integrity and responsiveness to funders, to clients, and to taxpayers. For instance, from Jason's perspective, a key element of accountability is being accountable to meeting client's needs. As he states,

> I mean, I would be negligent—I wouldn't be doing my job—I should be fired—if I got us involved in programs without determining the benefit to the agency, as well as the benefit to the client, and the stakeholders, before deciding to dive in. But when we're looking at something, even though we are less accountable—in the sense that we can't formally be voted out—I think that groups like ours feel a great responsibility to our clients.

April further reiterated that agencies are responsible not only to funders and clients, but also to the greater community.

> Not just saying, 'You know we're running this program, we need more money for this program.' As a taxpayer I balance that against my job as Executive Director of this organization. And I look at things from the taxpayer as well and I think I would be really frustrated. I don't want to pay taxes, that much money, for just to see four people successful in a program….That's not a good use of money. And if we are non-profit and we are spending the government's money to do a government job then we need to be far more efficient than that.

Mark also reveals the cyclical interconnections between transparency, accountability, and evidence-based practices when he clarifies,

> Evidence-based service provision is key, accountability and transparency is essential, but without data that provides evidence, transparency is not possible and accountability cannot be administered… and without accountability, agencies and people typically do not improve.

Fiona echoed her colleagues' comments about the need for accountability to funders, clients, and the larger community. However, she also suggested that rhetoric about accountability is also tied to cultivating greater citizen awareness of what exactly third sector agencies do. As she says,

> …the community, the taxpayer, wants there to be accountability for their money right? I think that's a pressure that everyone feels. But I honestly sometimes feel like if you would actually take a taxpayer who says that and show them all of the work that is actually getting done to steward and to work with all those tax dollars, they would probably say, 'Please pull that back a bit so that goes more directly to front lines.'

Fiona's comment reveals the importance of cultivating increased citizen awareness of the scope and scale of what front-line service providers are doing within their communities. Developing citizen awareness also raises a couple of key points about accountability frameworks. First, media coverage has implicated agencies who have not been adequately accountable for funding dollars, and this coverage can sometimes amplify perceptions of agency misspending and implicate those agencies who are responsibly using government funds. Second, reporting structures and accountability frameworks can often be a “one-way street” whereby government funders require agencies to account for tax dollars; however, government funders are not always as open or quick to inform taxpayers and citizens about the levels of funding they provide and/or the policy priorities that guide funding decisions (McKinnon et al., 2012).

Conclusion

This section has highlighted participants’ perspectives on resource disparities, with participants primarily identifying structural constraints within funding mechanisms, and the lack of employee investment in wage compensation and professional training. Further, possible reasons for such funding challenges was explored. Participants also discussed the ways in which they navigate structural changes, offering strengths and limitations of several strategies such as diversifying services, formation of umbrella partnerships, being resourceful, and cultivating transparent, evidence-based practices. The next chapter outlines how participants responded to questions regarding how funding policies and practices could build greater capacity for service provision, and how third sector service organizations can contribute to sustainable social changes for their clients and for their communities.

Chapter 7: Discussion of Results

Part 2—Policies and Strategies for Change

Introduction

Although both interviews identified issues of disparity—recognizing the 'lack' of something—they also examined areas of creativity, adaptation, and solidarity. To this end, participants were asked questions such as: Looking forward, what government policies could better support non-profits, and the sector as a whole, in service provision? What strategies have you found helpful with your funders? The eight participants who shared their insights were clearly able to articulate the ways in which the third sector enters a space where social challenges can be envisioned differently, and where funders and practitioners can build on strengths together. I was heartened to discover that several transformative peacebuilding themes emerged that reiterated the importance of maintaining focus on agency values—values that nourish relationships, community empowerment, collaboration, and learning—particularly when systemic factors remain barriers to sustainable change.

Nourish Values

Participants consistently acknowledged the importance of grounding service provision in principles that are responsive to clients and the community. For instance, Jason acknowledges that although some not-for-profits may stray from initial organizational missions and values to secure funding dollars, it is important to remain consistent to agency principles regardless of funder. As he says,

> …priorities of government change, government's change, so it's important to be flexible and to be constantly searching for different sources of funding. Now, one of the challenges is to do that and be consistent to your policy. There's an expression you might

> hear, “Follow the money.” And I can be critical of groups that follow the money away from their principles and their values.

Participants also identified that being consistent with values and principles was important for agency employees. As Tanya explains,

> I think that the staff who, the kinds of people who end up working here, are people who want their work to match their life values.

Tanya also identifies how agency values are also cultivated through hiring and orientation practices as she states,

> I think maybe there’s some hiring, orientation, you know, value-passing on practices that are important in there…

Nourish Relationships with Clients and the Community

A service model rooted in relationships with the community is a key value several participants discussed. Values rooted in responsive relationships with the community have the capacity to ground organizations and assist them as they clearly articulate to funders what they value and hope to accomplish. As Sam notes,

> I think that freedom gives us the ability to be so dynamic in the work that we do, and be innovative. Like we don’t have to stick to a structure that’s agreed upon in advance. With a funder we can say, “Let’s do this today.” Or, “Let’s try this out.” So it gives us the freedom to explore those new options and new opportunities.

Sam additionally highlights how the value of empowerment is correlated with community responsiveness, and this responsiveness requires research and consultation with the community.

> Well there’s always like—our consultation processes are pretty exhaustive. We set really high targets. We have like minimum numbers of engagement. We’ve set targets so that if there’s zoning on one block we say we have to engage with at least fifty percent of the residents on that block. And then thirty percent more broadly in the community.

Dana echoes Sam's comment by noting that a community development framework holds promise for building capacity within the sector as it has the potential to examine multiple relationships across multiple layers of society to collaborate with various community stakeholders,

> And if we can embed our work in organizations that are more community development, they often are much more on-the-ground. It's just sort of recognizing that all of these issues have multiple pieces. So for us we're always looking for partners we can learn from and who can be on the ground doing all the other pieces that person needs. This is only one piece.

A transformative peacebuilding framework rooted in community development simultaneously holds two values—that individuals need to belong to a community, *and* that each individual is unique and different (Homan, 2011). April discusses the importance of being responsive and a willing to engage in practices tailored to the distinct needs of clients—not a concern with maintaining the status quo as she says,

> So your practice should be evidence-based and you should have two or three models that you can utilize because you cannot serve all of our clients with one model. You need a couple of different ways to engage someone to be able to help people effect change in their lives.

Tanya highlights how these values are interconnected with ethical leadership—in this way third sector leaders need to be modelling values and behaviours to employees, which then has implications for how clients are treated.

> I feel strongly that we want to provide a certain type of service for our participants which is one of ethical practice. Being strengths-based, and being really client-driven and family-driven. You can't treat staff one way and expect them to then turn around and then treat clients in a completely different way.

Nourish Learning and Change

April notes that as service providers, we need to cultivate spaces that encourage and nourish change. Homan (2011) highlights how resistance to change can come from both internal and external sources. He identifies internal factors such as self-doubt, ingrained habits, and rationalization of the status quo; as well as external resistance from those that feel threatened by a loss of power, control, or access to resources. April illustrates these factors when she explains,

> We were trained to work with this sort of service delivery model because we had these clients. But that isn't going to be as effective, so we need to have more tools in our tool-belt. And not be worried that people are going to think we can't do our job when we do that, or that we're too proud to look at ourselves and to say, "What isn't working here?" And own that, and to improve that service delivery. And oftentimes people are so hell-bent on maintaining the organization, they've lost sight of what is the value of that organization anymore.

Natalie also highlights the importance of being receptive to learning—both within the not-for-profit sector and the public/government sector. Here, she reveals how creative, innovative thinking is necessary both with non-profits and governments.

> It's almost like we need some investment now to help us move in that direction, but the investment being given right now is almost more reactive than proactive. If we don't think about how to solve some of the social needs that are in front of us right now, I don't know how we're going to get to a place where we're less reactive to where our money is going. That takes some really innovative thinking, and a government that's very committed to true change.

Several participants identified the way forward in cultivating social change was by focusing on evidence-based practice grounded in research. As Sam shares,

> So I think I always try to find that fine balance between we're led by the community, but at the same time we understand best practices and we're doing that work that more on

> the—I don't want to say scientific – but more following best practice, following the latest research. We're merging both of those into one right?

Similarly Mark suggests,

> …search the world for ideas. You know, the world is so small now with the internet. Search the world for it with different ideas and figure out what's going to work best for our sociological, economic climate that we have here [in our city] that meets our needs. But keep your focus laser sharp on one or two things and do it incredibly well.

Nourish Collaborative Partnerships

The emphasis on learning and research was closely connected with collaborative partnerships. Sam makes this connection when he discusses how academic researchers can partner with practitioners in the non-profit sector to create sustainable social change,

> Like, it would simply revolutionize the not-for-profit sector if every student had to write one paper supporting something happening in the not-for-profit sector right? If we all had researchers where we could say, "Here's a problem we're dealing with. What does the research show?" And then we could take that back to the community and [then ask] what makes sense for you guys? And find that common ground and make change happen. It would be easier right? Rather than have to try and lobby for stuff. We'd have grounds to stand on to say, "Here's the research to back it up. And so now try to tell us no.'

For participants, the necessity of working with other agencies was not simply to extend funding resources, but as a matter of values grounded in a shared commitment to growth and learning. As Natalie shares,

> …so I think we really want to engage more with other community bodies who can help us reach some of the goals we are looking to accomplish over the next three to five years. It's knowing that we are only able to do so much—we need additional resources and help to keep building on where we are going. And knowing that the expertise does exist. It's just a matter of partnering with the right people.

Moreover, ‘partnering with the right people’ was predicated on knowing and maintaining agency values. Jason reiterates this importance when he says,

> It’s probably even been more important in the last ten years or so because we are trying to work collaboratively a lot more and joining forces on different initiatives. And so once you get two values and two sets of mission it’s more important that both groups have a clearer sense of what those are so that you can proceed together. And, you know, stay on course, and meet both peoples, both organization’s needs, and vision, and mission.

Several participants emphasized that although there may be a for-profit—not-for-profit duality in terms of political and economic policy, for-profit organizations can and should be socially responsible, and contribute to initiatives within the community alongside not-for-profit efforts. Although all participants were clear that non-profit organizations were distinctive in their values and approach to social issues—and would continue to remain distinctive—for-profit organizations were also seen as having a role to play in serving the community and ensuring a sustainable democratic society. Participants stressed that for-profit organizations can and should be socially responsible, and contribute to initiatives within the community alongside not-for-profit efforts. Research on third sector ‘hybridity’ reveals this trend and how non-profits are increasingly challenging the for-profit/not-for-profit distinction by engaging in social enterprises and public-private networks (Smith, 2010; 2014). For Natalie, developing partnerships between the public and private sectors was understood as a collaborative effort contributing to the development of healthy community,

> Sure, it’s good to do something because it actually feels good to give of yourself or give of your money, but I also think it’s about the viability and the health of any community. When you think of an ecosystem, everything has to be healthy in order to create a healthy ecosystem. I really think that the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors need to think of each other that way.

Connected to the development of healthy, functioning communities was an emphasis on including marginalized voices by engaging in power-sharing strategies with those community groups and individuals that have historically been shut out of these partnerships. Dana illustrates the importance of carefully considering agency partners when she comments,

> And even when I talk about the fact that we average a third of who we work with in the Indigenous communities is partly because we like to partner with the Indigenous communities and organizations, and see a real value in having an Indigenous organization in the work that we do. Because of the roots they have and the knowledge that they bring to the work.

Though participants often identified positive and long-term relationships with other community agencies, several participants admitted that there was still a lingering sense of competition between certain non-profit agencies within the city. Natalie noted that possible reasons for this competition may be due to the resource disparities in the sector, as well as larger systemic factors that position agencies against one another. As she says,

> I do feel that there are so many different organizations trying to do different things, and we're not working together as well as we should… But we have a hard time removing the barriers that exist for people to do that.

April further describes this isolationism as 'operating within silos', and recommends altering this entrenched thinking when she describes,

> …we need to be looking at less silos, and where are the potentials for partnership that will help non-profits be more efficient in their work? Not only for client service delivery, but [so that] taxpayers that won't have to pay each individual non-profit this operating money, operating in silos, when it's actually not helpful for our clients.

Nourish Funding Partnerships

Participants all shared stories of positive relationships with funders. In fact, two consistent words that arose among all participants when describing funders was ‘partners’ and ‘collaboration.’ Mark discusses the importance of regularly keeping the lines of communication and maintaining positive relationships open with funders when he notes,

> You know, as soon as I know anything, as soon as I sense anything, I’m on the phone to my project officer. She knows everything we know all the time. And she’s communicating that to her supervisors who authorize our funding.

Jason emphasizes that the size and steadiness of government systems can be a benefit and compliment to that of smaller non-profits who have a greater in-depth knowledge of clients and community,

> …because we operate on the street-level, not only do we have a close relationship and knowledgeable relationship with our clients, but pretty good first-hand knowledge of what’s available, what the resources are, how they’re working, and who’s providing them. And it doesn’t seem like a lot, but once you move into the [legislative building], or into one of those office buildings and you’re up on the eleventh or the fourteenth floor with two or three layers of reception and security, and you’re dealing with the [executive directors], you’re no longer dealing with the front-line workers, you lose your awareness of all of what’s out there and who’s doing what.

However, collaboration with funders is not solely about sharing commonalities and values—it is also about maintaining relationships when there are different operational frameworks and differences of opinion. Tanya highlights the tensions that can sometimes exist between funders and recipients when a different lens or service model is utilized when she explains,

> I think because often you get stuck in the fact that, you know, sitting in a meeting with that particular social worker, and that funding department, and we haven’t seen eye-to-

> eye on a participant and we end up having this what feels like conflict around what kind of lens we are using.

Here, Tanya stresses the importance of service providers finding shared interests with funders as she notes,

> Learn to know what [our funder's] mission and vision are. Learn them better than they know them…And so to focus on where that is the same, where there [are] similarities. And to bring it back to that and say, "So how does this plan that we're proposing for this participant, how does that accomplish the mission statement that we share? And to bring it back to that always.

In this way the approach with government funders is not adversarial but framed in terms of mutual learning and education. Dana offers,

> …I mean with all the cross-sector work it isn't that I assume [potential partners/funders] just like to put up barriers. I assume that there's reasons internal to you that I don't understand, but if you put your [issues] on the table and I put my mine on the table we might find a win-win by both figuring out—and it may even be better than either of us is coming up with individually. We approach it that way.

Fiona also describes negotiation with funders in terms of advocacy and educating the funder about the systemic barriers client's face as she notes,

> I think as an ED [executive director] I have to advocate with funders all the time on areas where there's a clash in what is seen as an appropriate expense or cost. For instance, advocating for why something should be covered because it's an important piece of [a client's] recovery, or their counselling, or their healing. And so that if that isn't covered we might not be able to provide it, and it's critical. So examples are things like bus tickets, or child-minding for women so that there's no barrier put in place with transportation or with child-minding care when they are with us.

Nourish Systemic Awareness to Deal with Structural Barriers

Several participants noted the systemic and cyclical nature of social service work and stressed the importance of recognizing cyclical patterns and the need to disengage from these patterns in addressing negative systemic dynamics. As Fiona acknowledges,

> I've been doing this for over twenty years so I've seen things come full circle a few times already, where you saw something happening that got taken away because the government or the funders decided that was no longer a priority and they were going another direction. And now it's back to, "Well we kind of need to focus on that again because we haven't been focusing on that…" Things are cyclical because you always want to evolve, change, and transform. So when that happens, I guess the hope is that you're not just going around the circle the same way over and over.

Mark identifies the need for social service agencies and funders to recognize the dynamic nature of meeting client and community needs within multiple agencies and multiple sectors as he advises,

> The key word is continuum. It's not a one-stop shop for everything. If you look at the journey of a person from wherever they're starting from—to wherever they need to be—as a continuum…

Several participants stressed the importance of designing effective service delivery models that have an eye to power dynamics and social hierarchies of privilege. For instance, Natalie's conversation frequently highlighted how addressing systemic barriers for clients with disabilities was integral to addressing resource disparities within her agency as well as within the disability sector. The systemic barriers Natalie identified are rooted in historical social welfare models which institutionalized people living with a disability and have lasting impacts today. As she explains,

> …if you live in a group environment whereby you're sharing a living space with thirty other people, there's only so much staffing support to help manage within that environment. People come out of that environment and have developed habits and have experienced some very specific realities, such as trauma. People come out of that and they have to learn to be okay again.

Dana shared that she understands her non-profit work within a community economic development framework. With this lens, social justice issues, such as homelessness and poverty reduction, are examined with a holistic view as the needs of economic development are positioned alongside the social needs of the community. As Dana notes,

> If you do economic development without looking at the social impacts, then you may actually be providing jobs but hurting the community overall. So within that, I think the term that [describes] what we really do is financial empowerment.

Here, Dana reveals how addressing issues, such as poverty reduction, is not solely a matter of economics, but also about a need for clients and communities to have social and financial assets. However, social structures can reflect power imbalances that marginalize certain voices. One specific agency program that tackles the issue of securing identification for clients in Dana's agency sees approximately eighty percent of its clientele from the Indigenous community. With this issue Dana reveals,

> ID [identification] is a huge issue. We put a lot of work into [addressing] the barriers for people getting an ID. But when you get the ID, it's not just the RESP (Registered Education Savings Plan], it may be your Indigenous status—your treaty card. It also may be that you haven't been filing your taxes. And you've got back years of child care benefit, which could be a lot depending on your situation. So there's a whole bunch of benefits you get now that you don't get if you don't file taxes.

Tanya also cited the importance of agencies addressing power discrepancies and systemic barriers for clients if they want to effect long-term, sustainable social change. Tanya identifies issues of white privilege that have had multiple impacts for Indigenous clients living with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder (FASD),

> …just take cultural identity. If you're looking at staff that have white privilege, and have grown up the way that we have, we have to be really intentional to take those lenses off when we're working with our participants. And we have to understand that unless we're actively talking to them about, about their culture, or actively showing them where they might be connected, or making referrals for them. If we're not doing that actively, it's not going to happen for them.

Further, Tanya articulates the responsibility of the government in not only providing resources to citizens who are the most marginalized within society, but also to addressing root causes of systemic barriers when she says:

> And so government should be focusing on some of the root causes, and we should be fixing the generational impacts of residential school. And I don't think there are easy answers but unless some of those really big root causes, systemic issues are dealt with, we're going to continue to have the needs we see here at [our agency].

Dana echoes this concern by noting how funding shortfalls have continued to impact Indigenous communities,

> You know I find it very frustrating, and maybe it's just impatience, that I still don't see the federal government, yet, flowing any money to the work that's got to happen within the Indigenous community.

Here, participants recognized that healing and reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities need to occur at local, regional, and national levels, as well as within and between economic, political, cultural, and social systems. Additionally, April recognized the importance of an extended perspective when considering deep-rooted conflicts and the legacy of intergenerational trauma as she says,

> We're never going to be a society that's problem-free, there's always going to be people that have experienced trauma and we can't always stop that trauma. We're just there to provide that support. So, you look at reconciliation, and recognizing [that] we have a very high Indigenous population. One in every five children in our school system is Indigenous, and these children are still experiencing the long-term effects of residential schools. That's not going to change overnight. So, I think its seven generations is what often Indigenous people say, and that's going to take lots of time of working with families to cope and function. So [one of our roles is] addressing the trauma and providing some of that infrastructure.

Building an infrastructure to build sustainable societies is at the heart of transformative peacebuilding. As Lederach (1997) describes, "Building peace in today's conflicts calls for a long-term commitment to establishing and infrastructure across the levels of society, an infrastructure that empowers the resources for reconciliation from within that society and maximizes the contribution from outside" (p. xvi).

Participants posed several creative ways that they work to build this 'infrastructure of peace' as service providers. Tanya cited the need for service providers to come alongside clients and advocate for and empower them as she notes,

> …when you have marginalized people, like we do in the work that we do here…I think that they need a voice and they need to be heard. So in the immediate future, their voices won't be heard unless other voices join theirs. I don't think that's right though. But I think that's the reality.

In addition to advocating for clients so that they can maximize their agency and voice, participants such as Dana identified the importance of agency's also using their voice to employ strategic negotiation strategies with partners and other funders. As she advises,

> …you're going to have your greatest power at the beginning. So negotiate some of the hardest things there. And then it's relationship building after that. So there has to be that kind of awareness. But at the same time, it doesn't have to limit your voice, you don't limit your voice in the proceedings. But you plan where the negotiating points are. That's the place when you have your greatest power with you. That's where they need you. And that's not to say anything negative about them, it's just that's how you do negotiations well.

Conclusion

This section has provided an overview of participants' responses to how to the third sector creatively adapts to funding challenges while also being a conduit of social change. They also clearly identify certain elements than can further cultivate change in service provision. Through sharing their stories and experiences, participants illustrated various ways in which the third sector can build an 'infrastructure of peace' by nourishing values grounded in relationship, community and client empowerment, collaboration with funders and other partners. They also identified the importance of naming and challenging systemic policies and practices of hierarchy and privilege that create barriers to service and sustainable capacity-building. Though participants all acknowledged the difficulties inherent in such a complex endeavor, I was honoured to hear their stories and share them here.

Chapter 8

Conclusion: Implications and Future Considerations

Introduction

I chose to research third sector social service provision because it is an important mechanism for equitably delivering and (re)distributing resources within contemporary Canadian society. My personal and professional experience within the sector also contributed to my desire and curiosity to learn more about how individuals, and particularly service leaders, navigate the challenges of funding within an economic climate of fiscal restraint. However, there is a lack of current peacebuilding literature that addresses structural inequalities within a Western democratic context—and particularly the economic pathways of social service agencies. As such, I invited eight directors of social service agencies to share their perspectives and experiences regarding resource gaps between government funds and agency needs, and why they thought such gaps existed – either within their agency or in the sector as a whole. Participants also revealed the creative and adaptive ways they have been able to navigate these funding constraints within current funding paradigms.

Literature supporting this research highlights the theoretical basis of complexity theory and transformative peacebuilding, and proposes integrated frameworks to examine non-profit service provision. By tracing the economic and political philosophies from the European classical period up to the contemporary period in Canada, the political and social implications of economics to address social inequities is revealed. The historical overview of social welfare additionally highlights how social welfare evolved in Canada from colonization of Indigenous peoples to changes after World War II whereby the government was increasingly perceived as responsible for maintaining human security in an ever uncertain world. The next chapter delves into the origins and function of non-profits, civil society, and the third sector, and outlines the funding dynamics between the third sector and the state both federally and regionally in the Canadian Prairies.

This concluding chapter provides a final overview of the eight participants' perspectives on the challenges of current government funding models, as well as some of my final reflections on the navigation techniques they employed such as resourcefulness, diversification, and collaboration. This chapter also provides some final thoughts on how participants maintain their commitment to agency values, while simultaneously cultivating positive relationships with their funders and other stakeholders. Recognizing this research is only one contribution to the literature on third sector peacebuilding, I discuss some of the limitations of this master's study. I also forward some thoughts on further areas of study that would enrich the topic of third sector—government funding, as well as some final reflections on how this issue interconnects with transformative peacebuilding.

Concluding Thoughts on Participant Narratives

Resource Disparities

This study reveals that the non-profit service providers located in this one Prairie city have an essential role in providing services to their communities. Moreover, various levels of government, and particularly the provincial government, rely substantially on these agencies to administer human services on their behalf. Participant narratives confirmed the significant impact of government funding on service provision. However, the frequent concern participant's highlighted was that *how* governments fund non-profit service agencies is equally as important as *how much* governments fund them. This means that resource gaps were often understood as resulting from current funding models and mechanisms rather than funding amounts.

For many of the participants of this study, funding disparities between government funds and agency needs were primarily characterized by the inflexible structure of their funding contracts. Rigidity of funding models was frequently cited for negative impacts on service provision, such as restricting which organizations were eligible to apply for certain kinds of funding, as well as constraining employee wages and benefits. Similarly, several participants discussed rigidity in the structure of accountability mechanisms. Although all participants stressed the duty of third sector agencies to remain accountable for their use of public funds in a transparent and evidence-based manner, the lenses and models with which funder's used to evaluate outcome measures did not always align with an agency's model of client and community engagement.

At the onset of the research process, I primarily conceptualized resource disparities between government funds and agency needs as financial in nature. It soon became apparent that participants had a more comprehensive view of resources, as resources were often described in both monetary and non-monetary ways. Although several participants acknowledged an increase in the government's financial contributions would certainly be favourable, particularly with allowing for increased benefits and remuneration to employees, many directors also stressed the essential non-material resources that staff, board members, volunteers, and community members contribute to maintain agency operation. Non-tangible resources such as employee commitment to agency values, dedication to empowering clients, and knowledge of the community were all cited as integral to the continued functioning of their organizations.

Reasons for Resource Disparities

Participants also offered their insights on why they thought funding shortfalls existed in their agencies and in third sector as a whole. Reasons such as electoral policies privileging the election cycles over effective governance, the limited pool of taxpayer dollars, and funders' bureaucratic mindset, were all identified as contributing factors to current, less effective funding paradigms. These reasons also lent support to the assertion that government funding is never 'a sure thing.' Several participants, recognizing their standpoint as non-profit service directors, were reluctant to advise government action on funding model reforms; however, there was consensus that more emphasis on creativity, research, and a community-development mindset would increase positive government partnerships with non-profit organizations.

Funding Navigation Techniques

Interviews also reveal the various ways in which the agency directors' navigate government funding mechanisms, and how these techniques impact their agencies and their relationships with funders. Several participants touched on the merits of diversifying funding sources in order to build agency capacity. For some, diversification is used as a method to integrate other funding sources, such as foundations and social enterprises. For others, diversification is understood more in terms of partnering and collaborating with other non-profit groups on various projects so as to expand opportunities for potential government funds. However, all participants were careful to point out that cultivating sectoral and cross-sectoral partnerships should not come at the expense of maintaining agency mission and values.

Although participants generally acknowledged that certain funding thresholds are necessary in order maintain programming, several noted their conviction to continue to provide particular programming even in the event of decreased funds. Here, several agency directors described the ways in which their organization was particularly resourceful at reaching and supporting their clients and community in enterprising ways. This resourcefulness highlights how third sector agencies can be flexible and adapt as they seek to be good stewards of funding dollars and utilize existing resources within their communities. However, a couple of participants expressed how a narrative of resourcefulness can inadvertently create a cyclical dynamic whereby pressure is placed on third sector agencies to maintain programming expectations year-to-year with altered or reduced funding levels for staffing or administration, or in some cases, funding contributions that do not adjust for inflation.

Participants shared several strategies for navigating relationships with funders such cultivating effective negotiation tactics, seeking points of commonality, and nourishing on-going communication. These strategies were simultaneously held in tension with maintaining agency values such as an attitude of learning, an awareness of systemic barriers for clients, and a focus on relationship-building with clients and stakeholders within the community.

Probing into government—third sector funding dynamics highlights the ways in which third sector service agencies occupy the intermediate space between larger-level government structures and local-level communities within one Prairie centre. Through their unique role, these service providers are particularly situated to mediate the social welfare space between their government and their community. Participant narratives reveal the important work that these third sector agencies do, and how such work requires creativity, resourcefulness, and collaboration to navigate the contemporary social welfare funding climate. Expanding awareness and knowledge of the services that third sector agencies provide to their clients and communities is important for democratic citizen engagement, but also for ensuring service provision is prioritized in government policy and practice. As such, more research examining the economic pathways that permits third sector agencies to continue as conduits of social transformation is crucial.

Study Limitations and Future Considerations

This was a small study involving eight individuals. Due to the scope of the research, I considered this to be a manageable number as I knew I wanted to interview each person twice—resulting in sixteen interviews in total. In this regard, my assumptions were correct, and I had more than enough information to gather and analyze. This said, I recognize that these eight individuals do not represent or reflect all of the various voices within the third sector—either in the Prairie region or in Canada. As noted earlier, one considerable limitation of this study is that I was unable to interview Indigenous-led organizations. For this reason, I have tried to be careful by positioning myself within the subject matter, and describing the narrative method I employed so that there were no expectations of larger generalizability from the data.

Although the method of one-on-one interviews gathered rich, contextualized feedback, I am aware that two interviews with each individual only scratched the surface of funding issues within the sector. As funding sources connect to multiple levels of society—and funding mechanisms are delivered in many forms—there is much more that could be elaborated on, and much more I could learn. For instance, every agency I spoke with had various funding sources that used multiple kinds of grants, contracts, and contribution agreements. To go into specific detail regarding each agreement would involve another lengthy paper. The complexity and diversity of funding mechanisms also highlights the expertise that directors bring to their professions—expertise that often goes unnoticed. As government departments fund almost half of all social service provision nationally (Frankel, 2006), it also reveals the need for an increased citizen awareness and knowledge of where and how such monies are being distributed.

Augmenting one-on-one interviews with focus groups was initially contemplated in the early stages of this study. There were several reasons I did not choose this additional method for data collection. The first reason was logistical—coordinating both my schedule and eight busy agency directors seemed to be a daunting task. The second reason was due to confidentiality concerns. I thought that people might be hesitant to discuss specific funding concerns with others in their sector for fear of reprisal or judgement. I also thought people may more freely discuss their perspectives in a private setting. These concerns were verified as confidentiality was cited as an important criteria to several participants. However, I also recognize that the use of focus groups could have added to participants' individual accounts and could have cultivated collaboration and network opportunities that can lead to further discussion and action on funding concerns.

Another study limitation is that although employee concerns were frequently noted by participants, this study did not hear from employees directly. Several directors mentioned that hearing directly from staff would enlarge and enrich the discussion on funding impacts on service provision. I could not agree more. As a former front-line employee, I believe such perspectives to be crucial in expanding inclusive spaces of critical policy engagement in order to ensure that such spaces are not just left to those who are in leadership positions. This too, will remain an important issue to be examined at another time.

As this study specifically focused on hearing the perspectives of non-profit social service providers, the views and experiences of government funders is not examined here. In order to obtain a fuller picture of the scope and scale of funding challenges within the current economic and political climate the perspectives of government funders would be of great benefit. This gap was mentioned several times by study participants as I invited them to share their thoughts on what political and economic factors contribute to government funding priorities and decisions.

As they rightly noted, as non-profit service providers they can only share from their own experiences.

There are two last limitations that I wish to discuss—not so much to do with the study method or the results, but more to do with the limitations in the lenses that we use in order to address peacebuilding concerns of conflict and social change. Such limitations are recognized within peacebuilding literature, but was also consistently reinforced through the study participant's narratives. The first is that paradoxical thinking is required in order to build sustainable systems that nourish and support individuals and collectives. The second is that social change can be threatening and resisted for various reasons that then make change difficult.

Paradoxical Thinking is Required

Transformative peacebuilding requires a healthy appreciation for things that are complex. Such thinking proposes that we think of personal and social matters not as characterized by linear cause/effect relationship, but distinguished by multiple kinds of relationships which can act and react in unpredictable and disproportionate ways (Law & Urry, 2004). Further, transformative thinking does not reduce the world to dualistic 'either/or' categories as it recognizes that such attempts are often attempts to reduce and confine reality in artificial ways (Lederach 2005). Instead, Lederach (2005) challenges us to take seemingly contradictory things—or paradoxes—and to look for how they intersect. As he challenges, "…we are thinking social spaces and watching for where these things meet, even when those meeting spaces are seemingly unimportant" (2005, p. 85). In this way, the economic dynamics observed through government funding mechanisms are intrinsically connected to who receives social welfare provision and how such services are carried out.

This kind of thinking does not often correspond with Western Euro-centric views of the world. In democratic social welfare regimes, the public and private spheres are more often than not seen as two dualistic sectors. However, Lederach (2005) cautions against envisioning the process of social change as a process of "side-taking"—of trying to gain the upper hand over our perceived opponent (p. 87). He advises that the true challenge for peacebuilders who wish to facilitate sustainable social change is to find points of connection with people who are not always like-minded or like-situated. It means working across the social categories that seek to confine and divide. As I have shown, the third sector often mediates these public and private spaces between the state and its citizens. This position holds great promise for peacebuilders, but also requires thinking about social change more complexly. For this reason, thinking about complex things can be resisted. As Dana, one of the study participants, challenges,

> You have to be willing to think complexly, in a complex way about issues, and folks want to think in black and white-- it's just easier. But it won't solve the problems, so that is a part of doing the cross-sector work.

Change is Risky

Change always involves risk. Homan (2011) notes that change requires people to step into the unknown and challenge their values, behaviours, and even perceptions of themselves when the systems around them remain the same. As peacebuilders, when we speak of social change and transformation, I think it is crucial to distinguish between positive change that happens organically from within a person or community, to that of negative change that is externally forced upon a person or community (Capra & Luisi, 2014; Homan, 2011). Although social welfare is the primary mechanism for addressing inequalities within Canadian society, this research has attempted to highlight how it is not a perfect system. Modelled after the early European systems of welfare, it is a system that is implicated in the oppression of peoples based on race, class, gender, age, and ability. For peacebuilders, risk is involved when we acknowledge these detrimental impacts and move beyond being simply framed as ‘professionalized service providers’ and seek to be relationship builders across sectors and other societal divides (Lederach, 2005). It means being open to seeing how people working at all levels of society – micro, mezzo, and macro—can be effective change agents. Dana describes the necessity of having people work together from high-level politicians to grassroots activists when she aptly explains,

> If you want change, it’s like baking bread. You’ve got have heat coming from the bottom and the top. If you have it only from the bottom, it’s going to fall flat, but only from the top, it’s going to get burnt.” And I really do think you’ve got to be putting pressure on for sure. But we’ve too often seen, “Yeah we put pressure on and then they did something stupid, you know. It wasn’t well informed, poorly designed. So yes, we need pressure at the bottom, but we’ve also got to be at the top. Having a voice on how it gets designed. And both of those things have got to be occurring to have sustainable change. Like we don’t just want change. We want sustainable change.

Postscript

As the adage says, ‘timing is everything.’ Indeed, the dimension of time is a key element impacting how circumstances develop through history, and how context is understood and framed (Byrne, 1998; Druckman, 2003). The importance of timing—*when* this study was conducted—became readily apparent in the months after this study occurred. As previously mentioned in Chapter 5, my research was conducted shortly after a federal election and during a provincial election. Both elections saw a marked electoral shift in political parties from their predecessors. During the study several participants expressed uncertainty with the new political landscape. For some, their provincial funding was in the process of being ‘on hold’ or reviewed, and they were uncertain as to when they would be informed of funding status.

Budgetary decisions are currently being finalized as I complete the composition of this thesis. The nature of this timing re-affirms that this study occurred within a specific political transition period that will have economic, social, and political impacts for the region. For instance, project officers for one provincial funding strategy that provided stable, long-term funding for community-based economic and social development initiatives has recently informed several agencies that, upon program review, they are not renewing certain funds under this program after 2017.

With these new events, several thoughts emerge for me. First, it is possible that due to recent funding decisions participants would answer particular interview questions differently now in retrospect. However, during the interviews with participants it was striking how often they would acknowledge the shifting nature of funding and funding decisions within politics, and never represented a particular funding stream as ‘a sure thing.’ This practical outlook on funding, the ‘it is what it is’ mindset I noted in my thesis introduction, calls to mind what Lederach (2005) refers to as a “grounded realism” (p. 55). Recent events highlight that this pragmatic acknowledgement is always held in tension with participant’s advocacy and community engagement. In recent weeks, several non-profit community leaders have individually and collectively discussed and responded to recent funding decisions within their communities and are acknowledging these challenges in the local media. As this research reveals, this community empowerment and active citizen engagement is necessary for sustainable change to occur within peaceable societies. For me, these recent events bring the purpose of this study full circle. It can serve to remind us that, in our democratic society, how government funds are allocated among citizens is an important indicator of who and what are being prioritized in both social policy and social practice—in short, *funding matters*.

Bibliography

Abels, R. (2009). The historiography of a construct: 'Feudalism' and the medieval historian. *History Compass, 7*(3), pp: 1008–1031. DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2009.00610.x

Ackerman, F. (1996). Foundations of economic theories of consumption: Overview essay. In N.R. Goodman, F. Ackerman & D. Kiron (Eds), *The consumer society*: *Frontier issues in economic thought* (Vol. 2, pp. 149-159). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. (3rd ed.). London & New York: Verso.

Anheier, H. & List, R. (2005). *A dictionary of civil society, philanthropy, and the third sector*. (1st ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

Anheier, H. & Salamon, L. (2006). The non-profit sector in comparative perspective. In W.W. Powell, R. Steinberg, R (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed.). New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Aronsson, T & Löfgren, K. G. (2007). *Welfare theory: History and modern results.* Umeå Economic Studies (No. 726). Umeå, Sweden: Umeå University. Retrieved from: http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:hhs:umnees:0726.

Atleo, C. J. (2009). *From indigenous nationhood to neoliberal aboriginal economic development: Charting the evolution of indigenous-settler relations in Canada*. Victoria, BC, CAN: Canadian Social Economy Hub.

Avruch, K. (2003). Culture. In Cheldelin, S., Druckman, D., and Fast, L. (Eds.), *Conflict: From analysis to intervention* (pp.140-153). New York: Continuum.

Bahner, A. & Berkel, L. (2007). Exploring burnout in batterer intervention programs. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(8), 994-1008.

Baines, D. (2010). ‘If we don’t get back to where we were before’: Working in the restructured non-profit social services. *British Journal of Social Work, 40*, 928–945.

Bank of Canada. (2012). Monetary policy. Backgrounders. Retrieved from: http://www.bankofcanada.ca/core-functions/monetary-policy/

Banting, K. G. (2005). Do we know where we are going? The new social policy in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy, 31*(4), 421-429.

Barker, D.K. & Feiner, S.F. (2009). Affect, race, and class: An interpretive reading of caring labour. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies: Knowledge That Matters: Feminist Epistemology, Methodology, and Science Studies, 30*(1), 41-54.

Beach, C.M. (2007). Why does inequality matter? In *Why inequality matters in 1,000 words or less* (pp. 13-15). Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Retrieved from: https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/growing-gap?page=3.

Beaudoin, G.A. R. & Panneton, D. (2015). Distribution of powers. *The Canadian encyclopedia* Retrieved from: http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/distribution-of-powers/.

Bellamy, D. F. (2005). Settlement houses (Canada). In J.M Herrick & P.H Stuart (Eds.), Encyclopedia of social welfare history in North America (pp. 326-9). Thousand Oaks, CA/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications Inc.

Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L.A Bell & P. Griffin (Eds), *Teaching for diversity and social justice*, (2nd ed.) (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bell, L. A., Joshi, K.Y., Zuniga, X. (2007). Racism, immigration, and globalization curriculum design. In M. Adams, L.A Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.) (pp.145-166). New York, NY: Routledge.

Benz, M. (2005). Not for the profit, but for the satisfaction? Evidence on worker well-being in non-profit firms. *KYKLOS, 28* (2), 155-76.

Blake, R. B. (1997). Part one: Understanding change. *Welfare state in Canada: Past, present, and future.* Ipswich, MA: Ebsco Publishing.

Blaug, M. (2007). The fundamental theorems of modern welfare economics, historically contemplated. *History of Political Economy, 39*(2). doi: 10.1215/00182702-2007-001.

Bode, I. & Brandsen, T. (2014). State-third sector partnerships: A short overview of key issues in the debate. *Public Management Review, 16*(8), 1055–1066.

Botes, J. M. (2003). Informal roles. In S. Cheldelin, D. Druckman & L. Fast (Eds.), *Conflict: From analysis to intervention.* (pp. 210-19). NY: Continuum.

Bouckaert, L. & Leuven, K.U. (1999). The project of a personalistic economics. *Ethical Perspectives, 6(*1), 20-33.

Bourassa, C., MacKay-McNabb, K., & Hampton, M. (n.d). Racism, sexism, and colonialism and the impact on the health of Aboriginal women in Canada. *Canadian Women's Studies, 24*(1), 23-9.

Bovaird, T. (2014), Efficiency in third sector partnerships for delivering local government services: The role of economies of scale, scope and learning. *Public Management Review, 16*(8), 1067-1090. doi: 10.1080/14719037.2014.930508

Brodie, J. (2008). We are all equal now: Contemporary gender politics in Canada. *Feminist Theory*, *9*(2), 145-164.

Brown, L. K. & Troutt, E. (2004). A cooperative approach to accountability: Manitoba's family violence prevention program. *International Journal of Public Administration, 27*(5), 309-330. doi: 10.1081/PAD-120028812

Brown, L. K. & Troutt, E. (2007). Reporting does not equal accountability! The importance of funding characteristics and process on accountability. *International Journal of Public Administration, 30*(2), 209-225. doi: 0.1080/01900690601118240.

Bruyn, S.T.H. (2000). Appendix: Great ideas in the academy. In S. Bruyn (Ed.), *A civil economy: Transforming the marketplace in the twenty first century*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press/Ebsco Publishing

Brysk, A. (2002). Introduction: Transnational threats and opportunities, (pp. 1-16). In A. Brysk (Ed.), *Globalization and human rights.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burton, J. (1990). *Conflict: Resolution and prevention*. NY: St. Martin's Press. ISBN: 0312037430.

Byrne, S. & Senehi, J. (2009). Conflict analysis and resolution as a multi-discipline. In D.J.D Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste & J. Senehi (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 3-16). NY: Routledge.

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives—MB (CCPA). (2009). The view from here: Manitobans call for a poverty reduction plan. Retrieved from: https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/view-here.

_________. (2007a). Populations vulnerable to poverty: Urban poverty in Canada, 2000. Urban Poverty Project. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsd.ca/index.php/research/urban-poverty-project.

_________. (2007b). Age, gender, and family: Urban poverty in Canada, 2000. Urban Poverty Project. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsd.ca/index.php/research/urban-poverty-project.

Capra, F. & Luisi, P.L. (2014). *The systems view of life: A unifying vision*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chappell, R. (2006). *Social welfare in Canadian society* (3rd ed.). Toronto: Nelson.

Christenson, C.P. (2009). Immigration: History and current issues. In J. C. Turner, J & F. J. Turner (Eds.), *Canadian social welfare* (6th ed.). Toronto: Pearson Press.

Christie, N. (2000). *Engendering the state: Family, work, and welfare in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Joessey-Bass Publishing.

Clarke, M. A. (2014). As a social worker in northern First Nations, am I also a peacebuilder? (Master's thesis). URI: http://hdl.handle.net/1993/30229

Cook-Huffman, C. (2009). The role of identity in conflict. In D. J.D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste & J. Senehi (Eds.), Handbook *of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 16-31). NY: Routledge.

Coto-Millan, P. (2002). General equilibrium and welfare. *Contributions to economics series*. Heidelberg & New York: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-50009-1

Cohen, M.G. & Pulkingham, J. (2009). *Public policy for women: The state, income security, and labour market issues.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Comeau, L. (2011). Social Exclusion, social justice, and racism. In M. Hurlbert (Ed.), *Pursuing justice: An introduction to justice studies (*pp. 100-20). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Cottam, H. (2008). *Beveridge 4.0. participle ltd.* Retrieved from: http://www.participle.net/our-vision.

Crosby, Andrew, and Monaghan, Jeffrey. (2012). Settler governmentality in Canada and the Algonquins of Barrier Lake. *Security Dialogue*, *43*(5), pp. 421-38.

Cudworth, E. & Hobden, S. (2014). Analysing Change: Complex Rather than Dialectical? *Globalizations*, *11*(5), 627-642. doi: 10.1080/14747731.2014.940247

Cunningham, F. (2009). What's wrong with inequality? In *Why inequality matters in 1,000 words or less* (pp. 22-25). Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. Retrieved from: https://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/growing-gap?page=3.

Davidson, P. (2005) Galbraith and the Post Keynesians, Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, 28(1), pp. 103-113. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01603477.2005.11051466

Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and chaos*. NY: Routledge Falmer.

Davis, A. (2007). Structural approaches to social work. In J. Lishman (Ed.), *Handbook for practice learning in social work and social care: Knowledge and theory (*pp. 27-38). London & New York: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Davis, B. & Sumara, D. (2005). Complexity science and educational action research: Toward a pragmatics of transformation. *Educational Action Research*, *13*(3), 453-465.

d'Estree, T.P. (2003). Dynamics. In S. Cheldelin, D. Druckman & L. Fast (Eds.), *Conflict: From analysis to intervention* (pp.68-87). New York: Continuum.

Delaney, R. (2006). The philosophical and value base of Canadian social welfare. In Turner, J.C. & Turner, F. J. (Eds.), *Canadian social welfare* (6th ed.). Toronto: Pearson Press.

DiMaggio, P.J., & Anheier, H.K. (1990). The sociology of non-profit organizations and sectors. *Annual Review of Sociology, 16*, 137-159.

DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-60.

Donoghue, F. (2010). Social origins. In R. Taylor (Ed.), *Third sector research* (pp. 37-48). NY: Springer.

Drakopoulos, S.A. (1997). Summary of Keynes' economic thought and theory of consumer behaviour (pp. 173-176) In N.R. Goodman, F. Ackerman & D. Kiron (Eds), *The consumer society: Frontier issues in economic thought* (Vol. 2) (pp. 173-176). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Druckman, D. (2003). Situations. In S. Cheldelin, D. Druckman & L. Fast (Eds.), *Conflict: From analysis to intervention*. (pp.94-119). New York: Continuum.

Ducharme, L., Knudson, H. & Roman, P. (2008). Emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in human service occupations: The protective role of coworker support. *Sociological Spectrum, 28*(1), 81-104.

Dunn & Pressman (2008). The economic contributions of John Kenneth Galbraith. In S. Pressman (Ed.), *Routledge studies in the history of economics: Leading contemporary economists: Economics at the cutting edge*. Florence, US: Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com.uml.idm.oclc.org.

Eady, S., Drew, V., & Smith, A. (2015). Doing action research in organizations: Using communicative spaces to facilitate (transformative) professional learning. *Action Research, 13*(2), 105-122.

Eakin, L. (2007). *We can't afford to do business this way: A study of the administrative burden resulting from funder accountability and compliance practices*. Wellesley Institute. Toronto, ON.

Elson, P. R. (2014). Third wave, third sector: A comparative provincial analysis of the governance of third sector relations. *Canadian Public Administration*, *57*(4), 527-547.

Eidelson, R. J. (1997). Complex adaptive systems in the behavioral and social sciences. *Review of General Psychology*, *1*(1), 42-71.

Elias, N. (2008). Power and civilisation. *Journal of Power*, *1*(2), 135-142.

Eoyang, Glenda H., Holladay, Royce J. (2013). Working as a social act. In *Adaptive Action: Leveraging Uncertainty in Your Organization.* Stanford Business Books. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Epsing-Anderson, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Evans, M. B. & Shields, J. (1998). '*Reinventing' the third sector: Alternative service delivery, partnerships and the new public administration of the Canadian post-welfare state*. Toronto, ON: Centre for Voluntary Sector Studies. Working Paper Series (No. 9).

Ferguson, I., Mooney, G. & Lavalette, M. (2002). *Rethinking welfare: A critical perspective*. London: Sage Publications.

Finkel, A. (2006). *Social policy and practice in Canada: A history*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Flaherty, M.P. (2010). Narrating the past to vision the future: Constructing civil society with women in Ukraine (Doctoral dissertation). URI: http://hdl.handle.net/1993/4466

Frankel, S. (2006). The non-profit and voluntary sector in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and the Territories. *Regional highlights of the national survey of non-profit and voluntary organizations.* Imagine Canada. Toronto, ON.

Fraser, N. (2007). Feminist politics in the age of recognition: A Two-dimensional approach to gender justice. *Studies in Social Justice*, *1*(1), 23-35.

Friend, C. (n.d.) Social Contract Theory. In *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from: http://www.iep.utm.edu/.

Frieze, D. (2010). *Two loops systems change*. Berkana Institute. Video retrieved from: http://berkana.org/about/our-theory-of-change/

Gallo, G. (2013). Conflict theory, complexity and systems approach. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science Systems Research*, *30*, 156–175.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by peaceful means: Peace, conflict, development and civilization*. Oslo: Sage Publications.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research, 6*(2), 167-191.

Gerlach, L. & Hurlbert, M. (2011). Part II: Social justice. In M. Hurlbert (Ed.) *Pursuing justice: An introduction to justice studies* (pp. 62-82). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Gibbon, J. (2011). Intro to section two: Identity (pp. 83–86). In R. Hull (Ed.), *The third sector*. UK: Emerald Book Serials and Monographs.

Girard, K. & Koch, S.J. (1996). Preface. *Conflict resolution in the schools: A manual for educators.* Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.

Goldfinger, J. (2011). Modern liberalism, conservatism, and libertarianism. In J.T. Ishiyama & M. Breuning (Eds.), *21st Century Political Science: A Reference Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goodwin, N.R., Ackerman, F. & Kiron, D. (1996). *The consumer society: Frontier issues in economic thought* (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Government of Manitoba. (2017). About Healthy Child Manitoba. Retrieved from: http://www.gov.mb.ca/healthychild/about/.

Government of Saskatchewan. (2014). Fetal alcohol spectrum disorder services. In Government reports and working groups. Retrieved from: https://www.saskatchewan.ca/residents/health/accessing-health-care-services/health-services-for-people-with-disabilities/fetal-alcohol-spectrum-disorder-services.

Guest, D. T. (1997). *Emergence of social security in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press. Retrieved from: http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=313172.

Habibov, N. N. & Fan, L. (2008). Comparison of inequality reduction and income security in Canada from a mixed to neo-liberal welfare regime: micro-data simulations and policy implications. *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, 24(1), 33-47. doi: 10.1080/17486830701848738

Haggar-Guénette, Hamdad, M., Laronde-Jones, D., Pan, T., and Yu, M. (2009). *Satellite account of nonprofits institutions and volunteering* (Catalogue no. 13-015-X. ISSN1710-9264). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

Haggis, T. (2009) Beyond 'mutual constitution': looking at learning and context from the perspective of complexity theory. In R. Edwards, G. Biesta, & M. Thorpe, (Eds.), *Rethinking Contexts for Learning and Teaching: Communities, Activities and Networks* (pp. 1-14). London: Routledge.

Hall, M. H., Barr, C., Easwaramoorthy, M., Sokolowski, S. W., Salamon, L. (2005). *The Canadian non-profit and voluntary sector in comparative perspective.* Imagine Canada. Toronto, ON.

Ham, J. (2014). Hope, healing, and the legacy of Helen Betty Osborne: A case study exploring cross cultural peacebuilding in northern Manitoba (Master's thesis). URI: http://hdl.handle.net/1993/23927

Hamilton, D. B. (1997). Summary of institutional economics and consumption. In N. R. Goodman, F. Ackerman, & D. Kiron (Eds.), *The consumer society*: *Frontier issues in economic thought* (Vol. 2) (pp. 170-72). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Hansmann, H. (1980). The role of nonprofit enterprise. *Yale Law Journal 89*, 835–901.

Harrison, T.W. R. (2011). Conservative party. *The Canadian encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/conservative-party/.

Hasenfeld, Y. (2010). Introduction. In Hasenfeld, Y. (Ed.). *Human services as complex organizations* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Havemann, P. (2013). Indigenous Peoples Human Rights. In M. Goodhart (Ed.), *Human rights: Politics and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 235-53). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helm, J.A. (2011). Revisionism and social democracy. In J.T. Ishiyama & M. Breuning (Eds.), *21st Century Political Science: A Reference Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Herkowitz, D.S. (1970). Fiscal policy, the quantity of money, and the stock market. *Financial Analysts Journal, 26(2), 35-42.*

Herr, K. & Anderson, G.L. (2015). Criteria of quality, validity, and addressing biases, generalizability. In *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty* (2nd ed.) (pp. 65-77). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications

Hesse-Biber, S. N. & Leavy, P. (2006). Analysis and representation of qualitative data. In S.N. Hesse- Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *The practice of qualitative research* (pp. 343-374). Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publications.

Hick, S. (2004). *Social welfare in Canada: Understanding income security*. Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Homan, M. S. (2011). *Promoting community change: Making it happen in the real world*. (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Cengage Learning.

Hudson, C. G. (2000). At the edge of chaos. *Journal of Social Work Education, 36*(2), 215-230.

Hull, R. (2011). *The third sector*. Bingley, U.K.: Emerald Book Serials and Monographs.

Imagine Canada. (2017). Primer: Government grants and contributions. Retrieved from: www.imaginecanada.ca/sites/default/.../finance_primer-government_grants-eng.p

Institute for Economics & Peace (IEP). (2016). Global peace index report. Retrieved from: http://visionofhumanity.org/indexes/global-peace-index/.

Itzkow, M., Kreklewetz, C., & White, E. (2002). *Sustaining Manitoba's voluntary sector: Qualitative research on Manitoba's voluntary sector challenges.* The Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative (The Volunteer Centre of Winnipeg, Inc.) at the Secretariat on Voluntary Sector Sustainability. Winnipeg, MB.

James, D.D. & Mogab, J.W. (1998). Introduction. In J. Dilmus (Ed.), *Technology, innovation and industrial economics: Institutionalist perspectives, essays in honor of William E. Cole.* Boston, MA: Springer eBooks.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (2009). To provide or protect: Motivational bases of political liberalism and conservatism. *Psychological Inquiry, 20*(2-3), 120-128. doi: 10.1080/10478400903028581

Jessop, B. (2002). Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective. *Antipode.* UK & Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers

Kappler, S. (2015). The dynamic local: delocalisation and (re-)localisation in the search for peacebuilding identity. *Third World Quarterly, 36*(5), 875–889.

Kassiola, J.J. (1996). Summary of materialism and modern political philosophy. In N.R. Goodman, F. Ackerman & D. Kiron (Eds), *The consumer society; Frontier Issues in economic thought* (pp. 159-161). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Kauffman, S. (1992). *At home in the universe.* Oxford & NY: Oxford University Press.

Kelman, H.C. (1981). Reflections on the history and status of peace research. *Conflict management and peace science, 5*(2), 95-110.

Kim, T. (2010). The welfare state as an institutional process. *The Social Science Journal 47*, 492–507. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2010.04.002.

Kjellman, K. E. & Harpviken, K. B. (2010). Chapter 2: Civil society and the state. In T. Paffenholz (Ed.), *Civil society and peacebuilding: A critical assessment* (pp. 29-42). Colorado & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Klages, M. (2012). *Key Terms in Literary Theory*. London: Continuum. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/contlt/key_terms_and_concepts/0?institutionId=1217.

Kosny, A. & MacEachen, A. (2010). Gendered, invisible work in non-profit social service organizations: Implications for worker health and safety. *Gender, Work and Organization, 17*(4), 359-80.

Kriesberg, L. (2012). Mediation in conflict systems. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 29, 149–162.

Kuklys, W. & Robeyns, I. (2005). Sen's capability approach to welfare economics (pp. 9-30). In W. Kuklys (Ed.), *Amartya Sen's capability approach: Theoretical insights and empirical applications. Studies in Choice and Welfare*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi: 10.1007/3-540-28083-95

Kumar, K. (2015). Nationalism or revolution: Friends or foe? *Nations and Nationalism, 21*(4), 589-608.

Lavioe. (2013). Heterodox. In B. Kaldis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of philosophy and the social sciences* (pp. 418-19). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Law, J. & Urry, J. (2004) Enacting the social. *Economy and Society, 33*(3), 390-410.

Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict transformation across cultures.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

________. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

________. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Lee, F. (2009). *A History of Heterodox Economics Challenging the mainstream in the twentieth century*. Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=215347>.

Lee, M.J. (1997). Summary of capital, labor, and the commodity form. In N.R. Goodman, F. Ackerman, & D. Kiron (Eds.), *The consumer society*: *Frontier issues in economic thought (Vol. 2)* (pp. 166-69). Washington, D.C: Island Press.

Levasseur, K, & Phillips, S. D. (2009). Square pegs in round holes: Vertical and horizontal accountability in voluntary sector contracting. *The Philathropist,19*(3), 211-231.

Leeuwen, M.V (2009). *Non-state actors in international law, politics and governance series: Partners in peace: Discourses and practices of civil-society peacebuilding*. Farnham, GB: Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com.libproxy.uwinnipeg.ca.

Library of Parliament—Parliament of Canada. (2017). Political parties. Retrieved from: http://www.lop.parl.gc.ca/ParlInfo/lists/Party.aspx.

Lutz, M.A., and Lux, K. (1996). The History of Economics from a Humanistic Perspective. In N.R. Goodman, F. Ackerman & D. Kiron (Eds.), *The consumer society*: *Frontier issues in economic thought* (Vol. 2) (pp.162-66). Washington, DC: Island Press.

MacDonald, D. & Wilson, D. (2016). *Shameful neglect: Indigenous child poverty in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

MacGinty, R. (2015). Where is the local? Critical localism and peacebuilding. *Third World Quarterly*, *36*(5), 840–856.

MacKinnon, S., Fernandez, L., & Cooper, S. (2012). *Breaking barriers, building bridges: The state of the inner city 2012.* Winnipeg, MB: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives—Manitoba Office. .

MacFarlane, N.S., & Foong Khong, Y. (2006). The prehistory of human security. In *Human Security and the UN: A Critical History* (pp. 23-60). Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Martinez-Alier, J. (2015). Ecological economics. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.) (pp. 851-64). Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.91008-0.

Mayer, T. (2002). Monetarism. In B. Snowdon, & H. R. Vane (Eds.), *An encyclopedia of macroeconomics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/elgarme/monetarism/0

McGrane, D. (2012). The politics codes of the prairies: A review. *Inroads: A Journal of Opinion*, *30*, 141-3.

McGrath, A. & Stevenson, W. (1996). Gender, race and policy: Aboriginal women and the State in Canada and Australia. *Labour/Le Travail 38*, 37-53.

McNeil, K. (2007*). A brief history of our right to self-governance: Pre-contact to present*. Centre for First Nations Governance. Featured Publications. Retrieved from: http://fngovernance.org/publications.

McNiff, J. & Whitehead, J. (2011). *All you need to know about action research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meighan, A. (2005). Winnipeg general strike. In B. Lenman, & H. Marsden (Eds.), *Chambers dictionary of world history* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Chambers Harrap. Retrieved from: http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/chambdictwh/winnipeg_general_strike/0?institutionId=1217.

Mills, G.E. (2007). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researchers*. (3rd ed.). Upper River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Monture-Angus, P. (1995). *Thunder in my soul: A Mohawk women speaks*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Mosley, J. (2011). Institutionalization, privatization, and political opportunity: What tactical choices reveal about the policy advocacy of human service non-profits. *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*(3), pp. 435-51.

Mulvale, J. (2011). Poverty, economic security, and justice. In Hurlbert, M. (Ed.) *Pursuing justice:An introduction to justice studies* (pp. 84-99). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Narveson, J. (2000). Liberal-conservative: The real controversy. *The Journal of Value Inquiry, 34*, 167-188.

Northrup, T. A. (1989). The dynamic of identity in personal and social conflict. In L. Kreisberg, T. A. Northrup & S.A. Thorson (Eds.), *Intractable conflicts and their transformation* (pp. 55-82). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Opt, S.K. & Gring, M.A. (2009). *The rhetoric of social intervention*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Owen, H. (2004). *The practice of peace*. Circle Pines, MS: Human Systems Dynamics Institute.

Paffenholz, T. (2010). Chapter 3: Civil society and peacebuilding. In T. Paffenholz (Ed.), *Civil society and peacebuilding: A critical assessment* (pp. 43-64). Colorado & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.

Pal, L. A. (1997). Civic realignment: NGOs and the contemporary welfare state. In R.B. Blake, (Ed.), *Welfare state in Canada: Past, present, and future* (pp. 88-103). Toronto, ON: Irwin Publishing.

Pateman, C. & Mills, C.W. (1997). *Contract and domination*. UK: Polity Press.

Phelps, R. & Graham, A. (2010). Exploring the complementarities between complexity and action research: The story of technology together. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40(*2), 183-197. doi: 10.1080/0305764X.2010.481259.

Phelps, R. & Hase, S. (2002) Complexity and action research: exploring the theoretical and methodological connections. *Educational Action Research, 10*(3), 507-524.

Pia, E. (2013). Narrative therapy and peacebuilding. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding, 7*(4), pp. 476-491. DOI: 10.1080/17502977.2012.727538.

Plunkett, T. R. (2006). Municipal government. *The Canadian Encyclopedia.* Retrieved from http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/municipal-government/.

Pressman, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Routledge studies in the history of economics: Leading contemporary economists: Economics at the cutting edge.* Florence, US: Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.ebrary.com.uml.idm.oclc.org

Pressman, S. & Holt, R. (2001). *A new guide to post Keynesian economics*. Retrieved from <http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=40379>

Pressman, S. & Summerfield, G. (2002). Sen and capabilities. *Review of Political Economy, 14*(4), 429-434. doi: 10.1080/09538250220000009889.

Poonwassie, A. & Charter, A. (2001). An Aboriginal worldview of helping: Empowering approaches. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 35*(1), 63-73.

Power, M. (2004). Social provisioning as a starting point for feminist economics. *Feminist Economics, 10*(3), 3-19. doi: 10.1080/1354570042000267608.

Pugh, M. (2005). The political economy of peacebuilding: A critical theory perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies, 10*(2), 23-42.

Razack, S. (2004). *Dark threats and white knights*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Rekart, J. (1993). The evolving 'partnership between government and the voluntary sector'. *Public Funds, Private Provision: The Role of the Voluntary Sector*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Rice, J.J. (2005). Social welfare (Canada): Since the Marsh report. In J.M. Herrick & P.H. Stuart (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social welfare history in North America* (pp. 361-365). Thousand Oaks, CA/London/New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Riley, T. & Hawe, P. (2005). Researching practice: The methodological case for narrative inquiry. *Health Education Research, 20*(2), 226-36.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). (1996). Final report on the Royal Commission on Aboriginal peoples. Library of Parliament. Parliamentary Information and Research Service. Publication no. PRB 99-24E

Rubenstein, R. E. (2003). Institutions. In S. Cheldelin, D. Druckman & L. Fast (Eds.), *Conflict: From analysis to intervention.* (pp.168-86). New York: Continuum.

Salamon, L. M. (1986). Government and the voluntary sector in an era of retrenchment: The American experience. *Journal of Public Policy*, *6*(1), 1-19. doi: 10.1017/S0143814X00003834.

Sarra, N. (2005). Organizational development in the National Health Service. In R. Stacey & D. Griffin (Eds.), *A complexity perspective on researching organizations* (pp. 172-199). NY: Routledge.

Sawatsky, J. (2008). *Justpeace ethics: A guide to restorative justice and peacebuilding*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

Scott, K. (2003). Funding matters: The impact of Canada's new funding regime on non-profit and voluntary organizations. *Canadian Council on Social Development*. ISBN 0-88810-518-5.

Scruton, R. (2007). Socialism. *The Palgrave Macmillan dictionary of political thought* (3rd ed.). NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Senehi, J. (2011). Building peace: Storytelling to transform conflicts constructively. In D.J.D Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste & J. Senehi (Eds.), *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 201-14). NY: Routledge.

Shaw, G. K. (2002). Keynesian economics. In B. Snowdon, & H. R. Vane (Eds.), *An encyclopedia of macroeconomics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/elgarme/keynesian_economics/0

Sheffrin, S. M. (2002). Fiscal policy: Role of. In B. Snowdon, & H. R. Vane (Eds.), *An encyclopedia of macroeconomics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/elgarme/fiscal_policy_role_of/0

Simmel, G. (1955). The sociological view of conflict. In *Conflict and the web of group-affiliations* (pp. 13-55). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Simpson, L. (2001). Aboriginal peoples and knowledge: Decolonizing our processes. *Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 12*(1), 137-148.

Singer, Peter. (2000). *Marx: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from: http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=75337

Smith, L. (2017).*Grant series: Research funders and find appropriate grants*. Retrieved from: http://www.techsoupcanada.ca/en/learning_center/articles/grant_seeking

Smith, R.S. & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting.* Ipswich, MA: Ebsco Publishing.

Smith, R.S. (2010). The political economy of contracting and competition. In Hasenfeld, Y. (Ed.), *Human services as complex organizations* (2nd ed.) (pp. 139-160). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, R. S. (2014). Hybridity and nonprofit organizations: The research agenda. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(11), 1494–1508.

Snowdon, B. & Vane, H.R. (2002). Post Keynesian economics. In B. Snowdon, & H. R. Vane (Eds.), *An encyclopedia of macroeconomics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/elgarme/post_keynesian_economics/0.

Sowell, T. (2014). The history of economics. In T. Sowell (Ed.), *Basic economics: a common sense guide to the economy*. New York, NY: Basic Books. Retrieved from http://uml.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/basicbasic/the_history_of_economics/0.

Spurk, C. (2010). Chapter 1: Understanding civil society. In T. Paffenholz (Ed.), *Civil society and peacebuilding: A critical assessment* (pp. 3-27). Colorado & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc.

Stacey, R. & Griffin, D. (Eds.). (2005). Experience and method: a complex responsive processes perspective on research in organizations. In R. Stacey & D. Griffin (Eds.), *A complexity perspective on researching organizations* (pp. 13-38). NY: Routledge.

Statistics Canada. (2001). Aboriginal Peoples in Canada. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Profile Series. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry.

Statistics Canada. (2005). Cornerstones of the community: Highlights of the national survey of non-profit and voluntary organizations (Rev. ed.). Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry.

______. (2010a). 2006 Aboriginal profile for Winnipeg. Aboriginal population profiles for selected cities and communities: Prairie provinces. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Catalogue no. 89- 638-X no. 2010003.

______. (2010b). 2006 Aboriginal profile for Saskatoon. Aboriginal population profiles for selected cities and communities: Prairie provinces.Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Component of catalogue no. 89- 638-X no. 2010003.

______. (2010c). 2006 Aboriginal profile for Regina. Aboriginal population profiles for selected cities and communities: Prairie provinces. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Component of catalogue no. 89- 638-X no. 2010003.

Stavenhagen, R. (2004). Indigenous peoples in comparative perspectives: Problems and policies. United Nations Development Programme. *Human Development Report Office*. Occasional Paper. Retrieved from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/indigenous-peoples-comparative-perspective.

Steinberg, R. (2006). Economic theories of nonprofits, In W.W. Powell, R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed.) (pp. 117-139). CT: Yale University Press.

Straussman, D. (2013). Feminist economics. *Encyclopedia of philosophy and the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stringer, E.T. (2014). *Action research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Suchman, A. L. (2006). A new theoretical foundation for relationship-centered care: Complex responsive processes of relating. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *20*, S40-44. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.0308.x

Tadjbakhsh, S. & Chenoy, A. (2007). The state and its domestic responsibilities (pp.166-184). In *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. NY: Routledge.

Taylor, Q. (2016). John Stuart Mill, political economist. *The Independent Review, 21*(1), 73-94.

Thiétart, R. A. & Forgues, B. (1995). Chaos theory and organization. *Organization Science, 6*(1), 19-31.

Thiele, L. P. (2011). *Indra's net and the midas touch: Living sustainably in a connected world.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Thomas, M. P. & Tufts, S. (2015). Austerity, right populism, and the crisis of labour in Canada. *Antipode*, *48*(1), 212-30.

Thompson, J. H. (1991). *Ethnic minorities during two world wars*. Canada’s ethnic groups. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Historical Institution. ISSN 1715-8605.

Tillotson, S. (1997). A new taxpayer for a new state: Charitable fundraising and the origins of the welfare state. In R.B. Blake (Ed.), *Welfare state in Canada: Past, present, and future* (pp. 138-155). Toronto, ON: Irwin Publishing.

Trautsch, J. M. (2016). The origins and nature of American nationalism, *National Identities, 18*(3), 289-312. doi: 10.1080/14608944.2015.1027761

Tsoukas, H. & Hatch, M. J. (2001). Complex thinking, complex practice: The case for a narrative approach to organizational complexity. *Human Relations, 54*(8), 979-1013.

Turner, J.C. (2009). Chapter 6: The historical base of social welfare (pp. 73-94), In J.C. Turner & F.J. Turner (Eds.), *Canadian social welfare* (6th ed.). Toronto: Pearson Press.

University of Manitoba. (2016). Traditional territories acknowledgment. Retrieved from: http://umanitoba.ca/admin/indigenous_connect/5728.html.

Vallacher, R. R., Coleman, P. T., Nowak, A., & Bui-Wrzosinska, L. (2010). Rethinking intractable conflict: The perspective of dynamical systems. *American Psychologist, 65*, 262–278.

Verkoren, W. (2008). *Owl and the dove: Knowledge strategies to improve the peacebuilding practice of local non-governmental organisations*. Amsterdam, NLD: Amsterdam University Press.

Waldrop, M. (1992). *Complexity: Emerging science at the edge of order and chaos.* NY: Simon & Schuster.

Walby, S. (2009). *Globalization and inequalities: Complexity and contested modernities*. London, UK*:* Sage Publications.

Wallace, R. (2009). *Grassroots community-based peacebuilding: Critical narratives on peacebuilding and collaboration from the locality of indigenous and non-indigenous activists in Canada.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: https://bradscholars.brad.ac.uk/handle/10454/4278?show=full

Walter, P. (2003). Literacy, imagined nations, and imperialism: Frontier College and the construction of British Canada, 1899-1933. *Adult Education Quarterly, 54*(1), 42-58.

Wesley, J. (2011). *Code politics: Campaigns and cultures on the Canadian prairies*. Vancouver: University of British Colombia Press.

Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the New Science*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

White, M. (2003). Retraining programs for displaced workers in the post-industrial era: An exploration of government policies and programs in Canada and England. *Compare, 33*(4), 497-506. doi: 10.1080/0305792032000127784.

Whitehorn, A.R. (2013). New Democratic Party. *The Canadian encyclopedia*. Retrieved from: http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/new-democratic-party/.

Wilmot, W. & Hocker, J. (2007). *Interpersonal conflict*. (7th ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wilson, M.G., & Whitmore, E. (2000). *Seeds of fire: Social development in an era of globalism*. Halifax, Ottawa & New York: Fernwood Publishing, Canadian Consortium for International Social Development & Apex Press.

Wolf-Branigin, M. *Using complexity theory for research and program evaluation*. Oxford & NY: Oxford University Press.

Zimmer, A. (2010). Third sector-government partnerships. In R. Taylor (Ed.), *Third sector research* (pp. 201-217). NY: Springer.

Appendix A

First Interview Questions

1. Do you currently receive government funding (municipal, provincial, or federal)? Why or why not?

2. Do you feel there is a disparity between available government funds and agency needs?

<u>If yes</u>:
a) What larger social, economic, and/or political factors have led to these funding shortfalls?

b) How have these funding shortfalls impacted service provision for the agency? For the client?

c) How have service programs and policies changed since you've been involved with the agency? In what way, if any, do you attribute funding shortfalls to this change?

<u>Prompt:</u> What are some of your experiences with a decrease in government funding [or an increase demands/needs for services] since you've been involved with the agency?

d) How have you and your agency adapted to decreased government funding [or increased demands for services]?

<u>Prompt</u>: Tell me more about your creative strategies in the face of funding challenges.
In what ways have these strategies increased/improved services to your clients?

<u>If no</u>:

a) What agency factors have led to this stability or sufficiency in government funding resources?

   <u>Prompt</u>: What social, economic, and/or political factors do you feel has contributed to sufficient program funding?

b) What strategies have you found helpful in your relationships with government funders?

   <u>Prompt:</u> Can you describe some creative methods you've used in order to gain government funding?

3. What social, economic, political factors do you feel have led to the funding challenges in the non-profit sector as a whole?

<u>Prompts</u>: Tell me a bit more about the resource disparities you see in the sector as a whole?
Describe some factors that impact your relationship with government funders.

Appendix B

Second Interview Questions

1) In your opinion, what is the role and responsibility of the government in providing and funding human services?

2) In your opinion, what is the role and responsibility of non-profits in human service provision?

3) Should non-profits be more funded or less funded by the government?

   a) If less funded, what are some other real and potential sources of funding that you could identify?
   b) If more funded, what changes do you think need to happen at a various levels of government (municipal, provincial, federal) in order to better support public services?

Prompt: What government policies do you think could better support non-profits in service provision?

[Question 4 would be asked depending on time available, and whether the responses to these questions in the first interview were unclear]

4) Tell me more about how you adapt services in your agency when there are funding shortfalls.

or

Describe the ways in which government funding has been beneficial to your agency.

Prompts:
Can you explain a bit more about programs that you been able to implement (or continue) due to government funding?
Describe a situation where a client was positively impacted by an increase in (or stability in) government funding.